

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
of UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
Bulletin

Volume 30

SUMMER 1944

Number 2

Editor

Ralph E. Himstead

Editorial Committee

Edward C. Kirkland

Robert P. Ludlum

Louise Pound

Richard J. Purcell

Publication Office: 20th and Northampton Streets, Easton, Pa.

Editorial Office: 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Issued quarterly: Spring (March), Summer (June), Autumn (September), and Winter (December). Subscription price (due and payable in advance) is \$3.00 a year, postage free. Foreign subscriptions including Canada are \$3.50 a year.

Entered as second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at Easton, Pa., under the Act of August 24, 1912. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

OFFICERS AND THE COUNCIL

PRESIDENT

QUINCY WRIGHT (*International Law*) University of Chicago

FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT

FRANK L. GRIFFIN (*Mathematics*) Reed College

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

JEWELL HUGHES BUSHEY (*Mathematics*) Hunter College

TREASURER

FLORENCE P. LEWIS (*Mathematics*) Goucher College

TERM MEMBERS

1942-1944

C. RAYMOND ADAMS (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Brown University
M. M. BOBER (<i>Economics</i>)	Lawrence College
WILLIAM L. BRADSHAW (<i>Political Science</i>)	University of Missouri
WALTHER I. BRANDT (<i>History</i>)	The City College (New York)
EUGENE PARKER CHASE (<i>Political Science</i>)	Lafayette College
H. G. DEMING (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Nebraska
RUSSELL PARSONS JAMESON (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	Oberlin College
A. LADRU JENSEN (<i>Law</i>)	University of Utah
GEORGE POPE SHANNON (<i>English</i>)	University of Alabama
A. CURTIS WILGUS (<i>Hispanic American History</i>)	George Washington University

1943-1945

GEORGE B. FRANKLIN (<i>English</i>)	Boston University
FRANK E. E. GERMANN (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Colorado
THOMAS FITZGERALD GREEN, JR. (<i>Law</i>)	University of Georgia
E. W. MCDIARMID (<i>Library Science</i>)	University of Minnesota
MAX MASON (<i>Mathematical Physics</i>)	California Institute of Technology
A. S. MERRILL (<i>Mathematics</i>)	Montana State University
LUCIUS GASTON MOFFATT (<i>Romance Languages</i>)	University of Virginia
FRANCIS EARL RAY (<i>Chemistry</i>)	University of Cincinnati
MARY H. SWINDLER (<i>Classical Archaeology</i>)	Bryn Mawr College
H. VAN RENSSELAER WILSON (<i>Philosophy</i>)	Brooklyn College

1944-1946

DONALD W. DAVIS (<i>Biology</i>)	College of William and Mary
WILLIAM JAFFÉ (<i>Economics</i>)	Northwestern University
I. L. KANDEL (<i>Education</i>)	Columbia University
JOHN KUIPER (<i>Philosophy</i>)	University of Kentucky
CLAIR FRANCIS LITTELL (<i>History, Political Science</i>)	Cornell College
RALPH H. LUTZ (<i>History</i>)	Stanford University
WARREN O. NELSON (<i>Anatomy</i>)	Wayne University
OTTIS H. RECHARD (<i>Mathematics</i>)	University of Wyoming
RICHARD H. SHRYOCK (<i>American History</i>)	University of Pennsylvania
ROBERT WITHINGTON (<i>English</i>)	Smith College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

A. J. CARLSON (<i>Physiology</i>)	University of Chicago
FREDERICK S. DEIBLER (<i>Economics</i>)	Northwestern University
W. T. LAPRADE (<i>History</i>)	Duke University

SECRETARIAT—WASHINGTON OFFICE

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD (<i>Government, Law</i>)	GENERAL SECRETARY
ROBERT P. LUDLUM (<i>History, Government</i>)	ASSOCIATE SECRETARY
JEAN PERRY LESLIE (<i>Government, Law</i>)	ASSISTANT SECRETARY

CONTENTS

THE ASSOCIATION AND ITS OFFICERS.....	163
WHAT IS A UNIVERSITY? <i>Quincy Wright</i>	167
THE ASSOCIATION: ITS PROGRESS AND POSSIBILITIES, <i>William T. Laprade</i>	176
PROUD SPECIALISTS IN FREEDOM, <i>Denham Sutcliffe</i>	196
THE HUMANITIES IN AN ABSOLUTIST WORLD, <i>Roscoe Pound</i>	203
.014, <i>Andrew J. Green</i>	217
SHOULD ACCELERATION AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL BE CON- TINUED AFTER THE WAR? <i>John W. Nason</i>	222
WANTED: A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT, <i>Horace T. Houf</i>	227
POSTWAR LIBERAL EDUCATION—A DEMURRER, <i>W. L.</i> <i>Werner</i>	233
TEN YEARS' EXPERIENCE WITH COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINA- TIONS, <i>Harold H. Titus</i>	243
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR WAR AND PEACE, <i>D. A.</i> <i>Worcester</i>	252
EFFECTS OF THE WAR UPON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1943-44, <i>Henry G. Badger</i> and <i>Benjamin W. Frazier</i>	264
ASSOCIATION NEWS.....	284
CENSURED ADMINISTRATIONS.....	293
MEMBERSHIP.....	294
ACADEMIC VACANCIES AND TEACHERS AVAILABLE.....	305

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATION INDEX.

Contributors to This Issue

- HENRY G. BADGER is Associate Specialist in Educational Statistics in the United States Office of Education.
- BENJAMIN W. FRAZIER is Senior Specialist in Teacher Training in the United States Office of Education.
- ANDREW J. GREEN is Instructor of English at Louisiana State University.
- HORACE T. HOUF is Professor of Philosophy at Ohio University.
- WILLIAM T. LAPRADE is Professor of History and Chairman of the Department at Duke University.
- JOHN W. NASON is President of Swarthmore College.
- ROSCOE POUND is former Dean of the Law School of Harvard University and now holds a University Professorship in Harvard University.
- DENHAM SUTCLIFFE is Instructor of English at Harvard University.
- HAROLD H. TITUS is Professor of Philosophy at Denison University.
- W. L. WERNER is Professor of English Literature at Pennsylvania State College.
- D. A. WORCESTER is Professor of Educational Psychology and Measurements at the University of Nebraska.
- QUINCY WRIGHT is Professor of International Law at the University of Chicago, on leave of absence as Consultant in International Law in the Foreign Economic Administration and in the Department of State.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Council action the *Bulletin* of the Association is, beginning with the present volume, to be published quarterly, rather than five times a year as heretofore. The present issue of the *Bulletin* is No. 2 of Vol. 30. This change in the frequency of publication will not affect the size of the annual volume, which will continue to be of approximately 700 pages.

Due to personnel shortage and the great increase in the number of changes of address for all publications, our publisher requests at least four weeks' notice of a change of address. Since the *Bulletin* is not published during the summer, recipients of the *Bulletin* should notify the Association only of permanent changes of address effective for the Autumn issue.



QUINCY WRIGHT

The University of Chicago
President of the Association, 1944 and 1945

THE ASSOCIATION AND ITS OFFICERS

The principal objective of the American Association of University Professors is the development and the strengthening of the professional concept of teaching and research to the end that college and university teachers will become aware of their duties and responsibilities as custodians of the interests of higher education. The extent to which the Association is achieving this objective depends in large part on the ability of the men and women selected for positions of leadership in the work of the Association. Among these positions are the Presidency, the Vice-Presidencies, and membership on the Council of the Association.

The President of the Association for the years 1944 and 1945 is Professor Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago. The First and Second Vice-Presidents of the Association for these years are, respectively, Professors Frank L. Griffin of Reed College and Jewell Hughes Bushey of Hunter College. The members elected to the Council of the Association for the three-year term, 1945-1947, are: Professors Donald W. Davis of the College of William and Mary, William Jaffé of Northwestern University, I. L. Kandel of Columbia University, John Kuiper of the University of Kentucky, Clair Francis Littell of Cornell College, Ralph H. Lutz of Stanford University, Warren O. Nelson of Wayne University, Ottis H. Rechard of the University of Wyoming, Richard H. Shryock of the University of Pennsylvania, and Robert Withington of Smith College.¹

Although many members of the Association have occasion to meet individual members of the Council, only a small percentage of the membership has any opportunity for direct contact with the national officers. These officers receive many invitations to address chapter and regional meetings, but because they, like all teachers, have classes to teach, examinations to conduct, and com-

¹ The 1943 election was conducted by mail ballot. The tellers' report, submitted on March 9, was presented to the Council by the General Secretary on April 14, 1944.

mittee meetings to attend, only a few of these invitations can be accepted. Unlike administrative officers their schedule of work is not flexible and provides little opportunity to meet outside engagements. Furthermore, the national officers of the Association have during recent years, like other teachers, been working in accelerated programs of instruction which place an additional limit on their availability as speakers. In order that the members of the Association might have some acquaintanceship with at least one national officer, the policy was inaugurated two years ago to publish in the *Bulletin* a brief statement concerning the incoming president accompanied by his photograph.

President Wright is Professor of International Law at the University of Chicago. Prior to his appointment to the faculty of the University of Chicago in 1923 he had taught at the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard University, and the University of Minnesota. Professor Wright is the author of many scholarly articles and several books on various phases of international relations and international law. At present he is on leave of absence from the University of Chicago as a Consultant in International Law in the Foreign Economic Administration and in the Department of State.

Professor Wright has been a member of the American Association of University Professors since 1924. He served the Association as president of the chapter at the University of Chicago in 1938-40, as an associate member of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure in 1925-43, as a member of the 1940 Nominating Committee, and as Chairman of the 1941 Nominating Committee. President Wright took office at a dinner meeting of the Association held in Washington, D. C. on April 14, following the presentation of the retiring presidential address by Professor W. T. Laprade of Duke University. On this occasion Professor Wright spoke on the subject, "What Is a University?" (See p. 167). This address reflects his concept of an institution of higher education and of the rôle of college and university teachers.

Although Professor Laprade has retired from the Presidency of the Association, he has not retired from active Association work. He continues, as one of the three most recent former presidents of the Association, membership on the Council, and he will continue

to serve as an active member of Committee A for two more years. The membership will recall that prior to Professor Laprade's election to the Presidency of the Association he had served as Chairman of Committee A for five years. His annual reports for that Committee reflect his judiciousness, perspective, and courage, attributes which are greatly needed in the performance of this part of the Association's work, particularly during the present stressful years. The inclusion of the most recent former President of the Association as an active member of Committee A is being inaugurated at this time. Professor Laprade's willingness to serve the Association in this capacity for two more years is appreciated deeply by his associates and will, I am confident, be appreciated by the entire membership. Professor Laprade's address, which he gave on the occasion of his retirement from the Presidency, was entitled "The Association: Its Progress and Possibilities." (See p. 176.) This address, which presents historical data essential to an understanding of the nature and purposes of the Association, should be read by every member of the Association.

The American Association of University Professors needs the service of many teachers of the calibre of Professors Wright, Laprade, and their able predecessors.¹ To the extent that the Association has able representatives of the profession in positions of responsibility—as chapter officers, national officers, members of the Council and Committees—it will continue to achieve an increasing measure of influence and usefulness.

Since the Association is not an entity separate from the membership, but *is* the membership, every member has a responsibility to use his influence in the securing for the Association of the ablest

¹ Past presidents of the Association: John Dewey, Philosophy, Columbia University; John H. Wigmore, Law, Northwestern University; Frank Thilly, Philosophy, Cornell University; J. M. Coulter, Botany, University of Chicago; Arthur O. Lovejoy, Philosophy, The Johns Hopkins University; Edward Capps, Classics, Princeton University; Vernon L. Kellogg, Zoology, Stanford University; E. R. A. Seligman, Political Science, Columbia University; J. V. Denney, English, Ohio State University; A. O. Leuschner, Astronomy, University of California; W. T. Semple, Classics, University of Cincinnati; Henry Crew, Physics, Northwestern University; William B. Munro, Government, Harvard University; Walter Wheeler Cook, Law, The Johns Hopkins University; Samuel A. Mitchell, Astronomy, University of Virginia; Anton J. Carlson, Physiology, University of Chicago; Mark H. Ingraham, Mathematics, University of Wisconsin; and Frederick S. Deibler, Economics, Northwestern University. (Institutional connections listed are as of the time of election to office.)

possible leadership. The membership is given an opportunity to participate each year in the process of selecting officers by suggesting to the Nominating Committee the names of persons especially qualified for Council membership. Forms for this purpose are sent to every member early in January with the bills for current dues. These individual invitations are supplemented by invitations to chapters urging cooperation in securing competent persons for positions of responsibility in the work of the Association.

The 1944 Nominating Committee of the Association, appointed at the meeting of the Council on April 14-15, is as follows: Professors William A. Brownell (Educational Psychology), Duke University, Chairman; Roy F. Nichols (History), University of Pennsylvania, and John A. Kinneman (Sociology), Illinois State Normal University. The Committee will meet in Washington, D. C. on July 2. A tabulation of the suggestions for Council membership received will be made available to the Committee in advance of this meeting. Members of the Association who have not sent in suggestions for Council membership or those desiring to make additional suggestions are urged to do so by letter addressed to the Association's Washington office. The report of the Nominating Committee for 1944 will be published in the next issue of the *Bulletin*.

RALPH E. HIMSTEAD, *General Secretary*

WHAT IS A UNIVERSITY?¹

By QUINCY WRIGHT

University of Chicago

In discourses delivered in 1852, preparatory to becoming the rector of the new Catholic University in Dublin, John Henry Newman, later to become Cardinal, considered a university "a place of teaching universal knowledge." "This," he said, "implies that its object is, on the one hand, intellectual, not moral; and, on the other, that it is the diffusion and extension of knowledge rather than the advancement." "If its object were scientific and philosophic discovery, I do not see," he said, "why a university should have students; if religious training, I do not see how it can be the seat of literature and science."² Newman elaborated this thought, distinguishing the university on the one hand from the scientific societies and academies, and on the other from the church. "To discover and to teach," he was sure, "are distinct functions; they are also distinct gifts and are not commonly found united in the same person." The discoverer must seek "seclusion and quiet." The teacher necessarily has "external engagements." The university, in his opinion, is a place for teachers and students, but if the student is the center of the university can his intellectual development be divorced from his moral development? Newman was the last who could be expected to admit it. Instead, he explained that intellectual education was valuable only because it ministered to faith. The university was, therefore, closer to the church than to the scientific academy.

Newman was not satisfied with this conception of a university, which, he says in the advertisement to the 1859 edition, was written at a time when he "was tried both by sorrow and by anxiety." In a later undelivered lecture on Christianity and Scientific In-

¹ Address of the incoming President of the American Association of University Professors, delivered at a dinner meeting of the Association held in Washington, D. C. on April 14, 1944 in connection with a meeting of the Association's Council.

² *On the Scope and Nature of University Education*, Everyman's Ed.

vestigation he conceived of a university not primarily as a place for educating students, but as an empire of knowledge. "What an empire is in political history, such is a university in the sphere of philosophy and science." "It is," he said, "the high protecting power of all knowledge and science, of fact and principle, of inquiry and discovery, of experiment and speculation; it maps out the territory of the intellect, and sees that the boundaries of each province are religiously respected, and that there is neither encroachment nor surrender on any side. It acts as umpire between truth and truth, and, taking into account the nature and importance of each, assigns to all their due order and precedence." His enthusiasm for his analogy may have carried him further than he intended when he concluded "its immediate end . . . is to secure the due disposition, according to one sovereign order, and the cultivation in that order, of all the provinces and methods of thought which the human intellect has created."

Before he had completed this lecture, however, Newman was speaking for a third conception of a university, for a university as a community of scholars, each developing his thought wherever his method and his interests might lead him. So great was Newman's faith in theology that he was unwilling to admit that the freest pursuit of truth could damage it. "A scientific speculator or inquirer," he said, "is not bound, in the course of his researches, to be every moment adjusting his course by the maxims of the schools or by popular traditions, or by those of any other science distinct from his own, or to be ever narrowly watching what those external sciences have to say to him; being confident from a generous faith that, however his line of investigation may swerve now and then, and vary to and fro in its course, or threaten momentary collision or embarrassment with any other department of knowledge, theological or not, yet, if he lets it alone, it will be sure to come home, because truth never can really be contrary to truth." He continues, ". . . this is a point of serious importance to the investigator. Unless he is at liberty to investigate on the basis, and according to the peculiarities, of his science, he cannot investigate at all. It is the very law of the human mind in its inquiry after and acquisition of truth, to make its advances by a process which consists of many stages, and is circuitous. There

are no short cuts to knowledge; nor does the road to it always lie in the direction in which it terminates, nor are we able to see the end on starting. . . .If we reason we must submit to the conditions of reason. . . .Good minds need elbow room. . . .And so indeed do lesser minds. . . .Geniuses are enthusiasts in their own line, and are simply dead to the beauty of any line except their own. . . .If you curb them in their speculations, researches, or conclusions in their particular science . . . you simply crush and stamp out the flame within them, and they can do nothing at all." What is there here of the neatly partitioned empire of knowledge with its provinces and its boundary arbitrations?

Newman might have added a fourth conception of a university which while not ignoring the education of students, the ordering of knowledge, or the freedom of investigators, would have emphasized the integrity of scientific and scholarly method. It is only investigators who use their freedom ever more rigorously to discipline their methods who have a place in a university. As knowledge expands, the relativity of truth to time and space, to assumptions and conditions, to sources and materials becomes more evident and requires ever greater precision of observation and of reasoning to distinguish the better truth from the worse and to detect the direction in which the still better truth may be found. Truth may be said to become better generally as its evidence increases in quantity and its expression more exactly accords with the evidence. In more specialized senses truth becomes better in the pure sciences as its expressions become more general or more concise; in the applied sciences as they become more useful or more convenient; and in scholarship as they become more accurate or more illuminating.

II

A university is not a community in the sense that its members hold particular truths in common or have common goals other than the most general goal of advancing truth. From these points of view a university is rather an anarchy than an empire. Whoever has been in a faculty dining room at lunch knows that arguments abound and temperatures rise. Two years ago a distinguished member of the Philosophy Department of the Univer-

sity of Chicago brought together for one evening a week through the winter two philosophers, two humanists, three theologians, one economist and one international lawyer. The object was to see whether they could agree on anything and, if not, if they could agree on how agreement might be achieved. They agreed that it was better to argue than to fight and on little else, but I think the meetings were worth while. From such discussions that get nowhere, investigation may progress. The apparently meager agreement here registered indicates a profound faith that the refinement and use of rational methods is worth while. In proportion as men have faith that argument is better than fighting, that the application of reason can solve problems, they demonstrate their title to be men. It is this faith that makes the university a community, a community of means and an anarchy of ends, a consensus on the way to truth and a multitude of conflicting truths. The members must be scholars who, though pursuing different and inconsistent ideals and making different and inconsistent assumptions, observe a common discipline in methods and procedures, confident that more rigor in reasoning, more accuracy in observation, and more discrimination in statement will establish better truths and that, as truths become better, apparent inconsistencies will be eliminated. Thus truth advances though new inconsistencies will ever emerge to beckon the investigator on.

Perhaps I have described not only what is a university but what is a good university. The greater the freedom of investigators to formulate and examine hypotheses, the more exacting their self-discipline in demanding adequate verification, the more the university is a community of scholars. But who is to judge success in meeting these criteria? Is the best university that which gets the most headlines, or the most votes on a Gallup poll, or the most students? Is it the one which attracts the most money from businessmen or from state legislatures? Is it the one whose administrative officials and trustees say with the most eloquence that it is the best? Is it the one that turns out in a decade the most entrants to important positions in government, in the professions, in the higher income brackets, in the Hall of Fame, or in the pages of *Who's Who*? Is it the one with the largest propor-

tion of faculty members and departments rated high by those in the respective disciplines? Is it the one whose contributions to science and scholarship will be rated highest by historians a generation, or a century, or a millennium hence?

This is a hard question to answer—as hard as to determine which is the best state, the best church, or the best business concern. A great institution is more or less *sui generis*, adapted to its particular environment and difficult to compare with others—yet, progress implies a process of evaluation whether the exhibits are works of art, horses, or universities. I think if truth is a function of able investigators using sound methods and if the proper product of a university is truth, judgment on this question should be by those competent to judge of the ability and the method of investigators. One whose capacity in a particular field of inquiry is most widely acknowledged in other fields should perhaps be considered the best judge, until the perspective of future historians is available.

III

There is perhaps more consensus on what generates and what corrupts a good university than on what it is. Money to provide salaries, laboratories, libraries, and buildings is necessary, but assuming these and assuming a group of able scholars, what makes a university great?

First, we may rank freedom of investigation, uninhibited by administrative directives, trustee interventions, or government regulation. As President Hutchins of the University of Chicago once said, "Freedom of inquiry, freedom of discussion and freedom of teaching—without these a university cannot exist; without these a university becomes a political party or an agency of propaganda."

Second, we may place confidence that truth is worth pursuing. That confidence may be maintained by administrative and public recognition of efforts if such recognition is based on suitable methods of evaluation. Real investigators are energized by an internal urge, but investigators are after all human. The character of the individual's association and recognition in the university, and of the relations of the university to the world, can stimulate as they can discourage. To stimulate a spirit of in-

vestigation and to inform the public of the value of, and progress in, the university is the proper function of a university administration. To perform this function requires discriminating judgment and the capacity to obtain advice from those competent to give it.

Third, of the factors which maintain a great university, we may mention tolerance for varied ideals, assumptions, and personalities. A pursuer of truth perhaps relishes even more than others the prerogative of making his own metaphysics. To tell a man, who has reflected, what the supreme values are is to invade his personality and to impugn his ideals, perhaps to question his integrity. The ultimate ends of life are a private domain which every man carries under his own hat. He may know that many of these ends are not achievable today or tomorrow or even in a lifetime, but the dignity of personality requires that each man be free to hope sometime, somewhere, his particular ideal will be achieved. Tolerance means a recognition both of the private character of ultimate values and of the relativity of all values. As Justice Holmes said, "When men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct, that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas—that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out."¹ In a university the market is confined to those competent in the discipline. Toleration among members of the faculty and the administration for fields of research which may seem to them unimportant and which may be for a long time unproductive is a condition for the development of a great university. Deliberation in judgment and realization that the germination of new hypotheses takes time, and their verification even more, are virtues which the public is likely to lack. They are virtues in which a university administration should seek to instruct both itself and the public.

Last but certainly not least important of the conditions of a great university is intolerance of careless work, work which sub-

¹ *Abrams v. U. S.*, 1919.

stitutes rhetoric for evidence, guesses for reasoning, and advertising for demonstrations. These are the great crimes against a university. It is in its collective condemnation of such methods that a university is a community. Those who are not scholars, in the sense that they do not join in this condemnation, have no place in a university.

IV

If freedom of investigation and discovery, enthusiasm for truth, tolerance of varied ideals, assumptions and personalities, continuous criticism of methods are the factors which generate a great university, it is easy to narrate the factors which corrupt such a university.

Gross interferences with freedom of thought, as by termination of employment because of unpopular expressions of opinion, can destroy the morale of a university for years, but subtler administrative interferences, as by unjust discrimination in promotions, in assignments of administrative work in teaching load, may be equally serious, as may arbitrary decisions in matters of educational and research policy. A university is not a church nor a reform movement, though the tradition of American universities reaching back to the college for preachers of colonial New England and the medieval ecclesiastical universities of Europe makes this hard to remember. In a community of scholars, policy can spring only from a consensus of the scholars, and its general objective cannot be expressed in terms of any doctrinal, cultural, moral, or educational objectives narrower than the opportunity of each to pursue truth as he sees it.

Nothing is more destructive to the search for truth than diversions of attention to problems of administrative organization, curricular changes, departmental jurisdictions, and distributions of power between faculty and administration. Such matters are of relative unimportance to either teaching or research but if agitated they may seem to be of major importance. All human activity, whether of teachers, investigators, politicians, producers, or preachers, proceeds best within a constitutional frame, but the proper characteristics of the constitutional frame differ greatly according to the kind of activity. In universities any constitution

so established by custom that its procedures fade from attention is best. Changes may have to be made from time to time as new subjects of investigation emerge, as new professions become established, or as new relations among established disciplines appear, but much adaptation can take place within the established organization and formal changes, unless made gradually and in conformity to a general consensus of university opinion, direct attention away from more important university activities. A university is not a political government whose function is to organize opinion, power, and administrative services. Totalitarian states which have sought to make universities agencies of their policy have destroyed both their universities and their civilization. Analogies of university government to political government are not likely to be constructive.

Vocationalism and technology in education, and practical applications of research, are today sweeping the country as a consequence of the war effort. As a reaction, voices have been raised in behalf of general education. Universities have and should train in the learned professions—law, medicine, theology, and social service; in time of emergency university research must be turned to immediately useful purposes; and at all times universities must contribute to introducing youth to cultural ideals. But if university activity is directed primarily and normally toward training for the practices, cultivating in the standards, or promoting the ends set by the prevailing culture it will fail in its major task. Education and research from which grow new professions, new cultural patterns, and new social objectives is the proper field for a great university. A university is not a business whose success can be valued in a ledger or measured by concrete accomplishments. If its organization and spirit approach that of a commercial corporation, as occasional trustees think it ought, it is lost. A public unable to realize the intangible values which a university serves does not deserve a great university in its midst.

Relaxation of criticism—lack of concern for standards of scholarship and methods of science—is the surest road to the corruption of a university, and eventually of a civilization. If a university becomes a country club or a social elite, it has committed the sin against the Holy Ghost.

A university must stand on its own legs. While recognizing that there is a proper sphere for churches, governments, corporations, and clubs, it must not imitate them in organization, in aims, or in methods. A university must live in a society and must relate itself to all the activities of the society but in the faith that its proper products, truth as a process and persons interested and skilled in the pursuit of truth, are of value to the society. If the society is so corrupt that it does not justify that faith, the universities have failed in their mission and civilization is tottering.

Members of the American Association of University Professors are custodians of this faith and make it their mission to foster those factors in university life which generate great universities and to stamp out those factors which corrupt universities.

In the years of war and reconstruction which lie ahead there will be strong pressure to substitute immediate for long-run values, to substitute local and national for universal values. The values for which universities stand are so long run and so general that they cannot be stated except in terms of processes and methods. Truth itself is a process which cannot be circumscribed in a formula or imaged in a Utopia. Recognition of the limitations of all truths, of the fallibility of all formulations, of the relativity of all values is the characteristic which distinguishes a living civilization with unlimited possibilities of growth, from the particular parties, states, or cultures whose objectives have from time to time been stated by leaders. Such assertions, while sometimes guaranteed to last for millennia, usually have shorter lives.

It is hard to achieve the perspective which can see education, life, and civilization not as an achievement but as a process, not as a destination but as a way. It belongs to this Association to cultivate that perspective and for that purpose to assist university men in this country in understanding the functions of a university, to encourage trustees, legislators, and administrators to give universities the opportunity to perform those functions, and to educate the public in the importance of those functions for civilization.

THE ASSOCIATION: ITS PROGRESS AND POSSIBILITIES¹

By WILLIAM T. LAPRADE

Duke University

Thirty years have passed since the professors in The Johns Hopkins University issued the invitation to colleagues in other institutions which led to the organization of the American Association of University Professors. In this eventful generation, during which the growth of the Association in the number of its members and in the realization of its possibilities has been gradual and orderly, it has never lost sight of the principles of its founders, though it has adopted a form of organization and has developed methods of action which they probably did not in all respects foresee. Many of those now active in the work of the Association are unaware of the road it has travelled to reach its present stage. It thus seems appropriate, in transferring to my distinguished successor the responsibilities of the office with which you have honored me, to recall some of the facts that have contributed to the creditable history of the Association and to consider with you the prospects that face us.

It happened that on my initial attendance at a Council meeting as a member-elect in December, 1933 the late Professor W. W. Cook (whose services to the Association were many and varied and whom we sadly miss at this meeting) recognized as I do now the importance of keeping in mind the past while we venture into the future. In his address as retiring President of the Association he commented on the record of the preceding twenty years. As he did, I venture to quote again² the purposes of the Association

¹ Address of the retiring President of the American Association of University Professors delivered at a dinner meeting of the Association held in Washington, D. C. on April 14, 1944 in connection with a meeting of the Association's Council.

² February, 1934 *Bulletin*, pp. 84-96.

as stated by the Committee on Organization:

... to bring about more effective cooperation among the members of the profession in the discharge of their special responsibilities as custodians of the interests of higher education and research in America; to promote a more general and methodical discussion of problems relating to education in the institutions of higher learning; to create means for the authoritative expression of the public opinion of the body of college and university teachers; to make collective action possible, and in general to maintain and advance the ideals and standards of the profession.

Professor John Dewey, Chairman of the initial meeting held in New York, whose admirers have attributed to him some gifts of prophecy, voiced the desirability that discussions of these topics be "lifted from the plane of emotion to that of intelligence." The defense of academic freedom and tenure, being already a concern of the existing learned societies, would not, he was "confident . . . be more than an incident of the activities of the Association in developing professional standards." Nevertheless, the organizers assigned to a distinguished committee, of which Professor E. R. A. Seligman was chairman, the task of making its first report on that subject.

This report, made in 1915 and several times subsequently reprinted in the *Bulletin*,¹ served as a basis for what was destined to be one of the major activities of the new Association. It was scarcely organized before a series of incidents in institutions in different parts of the country attracted attention. President Dewey confessed at the end of his term (December, 1915) that whereas the general report on academic freedom and tenure was "definitely contemplated in the plan of the year's work," the "investigations of particular cases" were "literally thrust upon" the Committee. "To have failed to meet the demands would . . . have tended to destroy all confidence in the Association as anything more than a talking body." In fact, he felt that "the work done on particular cases . . . turned out to be of the most constructive sort that could have been undertaken."

Nevertheless, the second President of the Association, Professor John Henry Wigmore, while admitting at the end of his term in

The most recent reprinting appears in February, 1943 *Bulletin*, pp. 82-101.

1916 that "circumstances" made the defense of academic freedom prominent in its work during the first two years, took care to assure the public that the "Association exists for *all* the purposes involved in advancing the common interests of university education in this country." He pointed out that the Association had "already eighteen committees," of which that on academic freedom and tenure was merely one. In his presidential address in 1933 Professor Cook sought to counter the notion, "spread abroad by unauthorized persons immediately after the organization of the Association," that it "was formed primarily for the defense or protection of its members or at least for the protection of academic freedom and tenure." In support of his point he enumerated the diverse activities of the Association in the preceding twenty years. This diversity of activities has, of course, been maintained since 1933.

Notwithstanding these statements and protestations, however, and their solid basis in fact, may we not now admit without apology and with some degree of pride that the most distinctive work of the Association thus far has been its defense of academic freedom and tenure? "For that alone of all its activities," said Chancellor Samuel P. Capen addressing the Annual Meeting of the Association in 1936, "it is known both in educational circles and among the laity. On the character and effectiveness of that defense its reputation will continue to rest in the immediate future, whether its members would have it so or not."¹ The same speaker went on to say that the Association "has seen from the outset that academic freedom and security of tenure go together, that one cannot be had without the other. Thus it has emphasized the crucial importance to colleges and universities of a policy of definite and stable tenure of office and of judicial procedures for the abrogation of tenure. Indeed the Association is responsible in a larger measure than any other agency for the formulation and spread of the principles which should guide the policies of higher institutions with respect to free inquiry, free speech, and the conditions of academic employment; principles which do now in fact guide the policies of the most enlightened institutions." If this generous acknowledgment of the achievement of the Asso-

¹ March, 1937 *Bulletin*, pp. 190-201.

ciation were only partially true, it would not be surprising to discover that this phase of the work of the Association has contributed more than any other to influence its institutional growth.

In my concluding report as Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure I ventured to narrate in some detail the previous history of the work of that Committee and to describe its current methods of procedure.¹ There is not time now to repeat what was said then if we are to consider in the perspective of thirty years the efforts of the Association to adapt itself to the changing needs of the academic community as they became apparent. The underlying assumptions have changed little since they were formulated in the first report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure in 1915. In summary, they are that universities and colleges exist primarily to enable members of their faculties to do their peculiar work, which is to cherish and enhance the store of human knowledge and understanding, transmitting that which they have received from the past to the succeeding generation, enlarged and expanded. Those charged with the fulfillment of this trust need freedom to delve and to criticize, which requires security of sustenance and residence in a community affording access to essential apparatus and to youths able and willing to receive and transmit this precious heritage. All of the resources of the organizations devoted to higher education are for the purpose of enabling scholars and teachers to do the work assigned to them by society. It is the duty of the profession itself to strive for the maintenance of conditions essential for the accomplishment of this undertaking. Any organization of the profession ought to be dedicated primarily to the achievement of this purpose.

Those who initiated the Association felt that this purpose could best be served by an organization of members who had held for at least ten years appointments in institutions of higher learning and who had arrived at a stage of "recognized scholarship or scientific productivity." Such persons might naturally have been expected to have some understanding of the causes the Association was intended to espouse, and their reputations were calculated to give weight to any cause they jointly supported. The trouble was

there were too few of them. This despite the rapidly increasing number of youths who, after the first World War, aspired to a college education and the corresponding increase in the membership of the faculties of the universities and colleges. In its first year the Association enrolled approximately fifteen hundred members, which in ten years increased to five thousand. By that time the work of the Association and of other organizations in behalf of the profession had led to the Washington Conference of 1925 and the resulting statement concerning freedom and tenure. It was soon clear that if the Association was to take the lead in making this statement more than an hortatory pronouncement it needed apparatus for action which it did not then have.

Hitherto it had depended largely upon voluntary service or part-time compensated assistance of interested members. There was manifest need of a central office, which the existing membership could not support, and the Association could appropriately have no other source of income than the dues and contributions of its members. In view of these facts responsible leaders in the organization reached the very natural conclusion that younger members of the profession had as great a stake as their more successful elders in maintaining it on a sound basis. Consequently the preliminary term of service required for membership was reduced; graduate students were even encouraged to enroll as junior members. A central office was established at Washington in 1929, and a campaign for an increased membership was conducted. By the end of that campaign there were more than ten thousand members.

II

This increase in the membership of the Association, which came in the initial years of the depression, intensified and revealed almost as many problems as it solved. Some of these problems occupied much of the attention of the Council when I was first elected a member. For one thing, it was at once clear that the larger membership added substantially to the burden of routine correspondence requiring constant and prompt attention if the ground gained was not to be lost. The temporary organization,

improvised in Washington for the membership campaign, could not, therefore, be disbanded until something was ready to replace it. Furthermore, the marked increase in the service entailed upon the officers of the Association by freedom and tenure cases due to the depression made an expansion of the facilities for that work imperative. But the General Secretary, Dr. Harry W. Tyler, was approaching the end of his career and sought retirement.

The Association owed much in its early years to Dr. Tyler's active interest and is unlikely ever to have a more devoted officer. It seemed desirable, therefore, to retain as far as possible the benefit of his experience and judgment, but it would have been unreasonable to expect him to assume the burden of organizing the growing volume of work that soon began to flow through the Washington Office. Accordingly, Dr. W. W. Cook, on the expiration of his term as President in December, 1933, agreed to devote a part of his time to the post of General Secretary. He served the Association in this capacity until September, 1935, when he accepted a position on the faculty of the Law School of Northwestern University. In selecting a successor to Dr. Cook the members of the Council were agreed that the Association needed as General Secretary a younger man, willing to undertake the office as a career, to have the oversight of the clerical staff in the central office and of any associates who might be appointed, and to afford to the Association the benefit of knowledge and wisdom that could be acquired only by long experience.

The present General Secretary, Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, on taking office in 1936, thus had the responsibility with the Council of so organizing the central office of the Association as to enable it to render efficient service to the profession, to retain the confidence of the members already enlisted, to attract a sufficient number of new members both to account for deletions and to insure a steady growth in the total number, and in general to act as the agent of the Association in dealing with matters with which it is appropriately concerned. Toward the close of Professor Frederick S. Deibler's term as President in 1941 it seemed clear to him and to other members of the Council that Dr. Himstead had already succeeded in a sufficient degree in accomplishing the things for which he was elected to make it highly desirable that he be re-

tained in the office on indefinite tenure. Accordingly, on Dr. Deibler's recommendation, the Council entered into an agreement with Dr. Himstead providing for such an appointment and for an annual increment to its emoluments until it should reach a point of modest dignity comparable with the burdens and responsibilities of the office.

The effectiveness of the Association in mobilizing the opinion and influence of the profession on a national basis depends so largely on the work done in the Washington office that its successful establishment may fairly be regarded as among the most notable achievements thus far in the Association's history. My work with the General Secretary during the time I have had the honor of being your President has served to confirm the opinion I expressed two years ago in my final report as Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, that because of his experience and the insight accruing to him therefrom the Association has in Dr. Himstead a priceless servant whom no amount of mere ability and expertness could replace.

Second only to the organization of the central secretarial office was the provision of a publication affording a means of communication between the officers of the Association and its members and a forum for educational discussion and comment. From the beginning the Association has published a *Bulletin*, which is currently in its thirtieth volume. It would have been difficult to conduct the affairs of the organization without it. From the outset the Annual Meetings and committees of the Association, especially the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, have supplied the most substantial content of the *Bulletin*. In the last several years of his life Dr. Tyler served the Association as its editor. It was quite naturally the case, however, that until the central office was organized on a sound basis little could be done to make the *Bulletin* the medium of educational discussion which the founders of the Association envisaged. No doubt it has possibilities as yet unrealized, but the General Secretary as editor and the Editorial Committee associated with him have contributed much to its improvement both in form and content. It is now a creditable magazine, purveying to readers interested in higher education useful information and stimulating comment.

III

Several of the most troublesome problems precipitated by the rapid increase in the membership of the Association concerned the election of officers, the organization of local divisions, and the allocation of functions as between these local divisions and the general officers. In the early days, when the membership was smaller, the nominating committee reported each year a single slate of candidates for the vacant offices, whose election by the members attending the Annual Meeting followed almost invariably. Indeed it was the practice to invite the new nominees to the Council to attend the meeting at which they were elected in order that they might have an initial acquaintance with the duties of their office.

Complaints arose in time that not all subjects represented on faculties, not all sections of the country, not all types of institutions having members in the Association were proportionately represented on the Council. A little reflection makes it clear that not all of these desiderata are ever likely to be achieved in a single Council, but the Association concluded that the nominating committee ought to be selected by the President with the advice and consent of the current Council, that members of the Council ought to be chosen from specified areas, that two candidates ought to be suggested for each vacancy on the Council, and that care should be taken to insure that these candidates are distributed as well as may be among the subjects of interest and the types of institution represented among members of the Association.

It would have been surprising had not the members of the Association attempted by these methods to increase its efficiency and to improve its organization in its formative years. During all of these years, however, each succeeding group of members of the Council has had to discover in turn by actual intimate acquaintance with the general work of the Association its potentialities and its limitations. All too frequently, by the time members of the Council have arrived at a stage of knowledge and understanding enabling them to render maximum service, their terms of office have expired. But the loss to the Association would probably have been greater had it lacked this constant stream of new

members of the Council from all sections of the country coming to share the responsibility for the management of its national organization.

The question of the allocation of functions between the local groups and the national organization called for especially careful consideration. Before the end of the first year of the Association the need appeared for a local organization of its members. Dr. Dewey in his report as President observed: "We must devise some means of stimulating and securing local cooperation and trust. . . . At the same time the Association must remain a national Association, concerned with common and fundamental interests; it must not in any way entangle itself in local politics or controversies." In a letter of advice published in the following April (1916), the new President, Professor Wigmore, and Secretary Tyler suggested that organizers of chapters feel their way, "taking account of the experience obtained." In their opinion the purpose of the chapters was "to assist in developing professional opinion," which was important enough "of itself to give the chapters an ample reason for existence and activity." They did not anticipate that the chapters as such would have a share in the government of the Association.

Succeeding Presidents of the Association and the Councils working with them have devoted much time to this problem, as the records of their proceedings amply indicate, but the activities of the several chapters have always depended upon local conditions and local leadership, varying accordingly from year to year and among institutions. Dr. Tyler's long experience as General Secretary confirmed for him the soundness of the original decision, and in his concluding report as General Secretary he recorded his "judgment" that the Association should "continue to be a national association of individual members rather than a federation of heterogeneous chapters, using the adjective in the sense that any sort of uniformity of chapter organization or management is precluded by the diversity of local conditions."

The principal functions of the chapters of the Association may be summarized as follows: to consider questions of general concern to college and university teachers and current local questions of educational policy or method; to act as an initiating agency for

faculty action; to take action upon specific matters of Association business submitted to the chapters by the Council or the national officers; and to cooperate with the national organization in dealing with professional and educational problems. The General Secretary of the Association communicates currently with chapter officers through the medium of Chapter Letters.

For many years the Association has had a national Committee on Organization and Conduct of Chapters. The increase in the number of chapters from 50 in 1916 to 227 in 1933 suggested to this Committee, of which the late Professor George H. Ryden was long the Chairman, the desirability of arranging the country into regions with a member of the Committee in each region responsible for visiting chapters and stimulating activity. There are now sixteen such regions. Successful regional meetings have been held, affording an opportunity for those having experience with the national organization to share their knowledge and insight with members not similarly favored. Since the death of Professor Ryden, Professor Francis J. Tschan has succeeded to the leadership of this important work, unhappily much interrupted by the war.

Experience seems amply to have justified the original decision that the burden of the Association's work in behalf of freedom and tenure be vested in its responsible national officers rather than in the chapters. A major portion of the General Secretary's time and at present of that of the Associate Secretary and the Assistant Secretary as well is devoted to that work. A considerable part of the space in the *Bulletin* is allotted to it. Field work and similar expenses require additional appropriations from the Association's funds. Naturally, then, this major activity of the Association has profoundly influenced its character. Professor E. C. Kirkland, whom the Association is fortunate to have as Chairman of the Committee responsible for this phase of its work, has indicated in his two annual reports that the volume of this activity shows no tendency to abate. In fact, in view of the circumstances in which the institutions of higher education now find themselves, the labor involved in defending academic freedom and tenure may probably increase in the immediate future. We may well re-examine for a moment, therefore, the assumptions on which the Association has hitherto based this part of its work. Upon the soundness of these

assumptions will depend the continued existence and success of the Association.

IV

The first report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure devoted a major part of its attention to what its authors called "The Nature of the Academic Calling" and "The Function of the Academic Institution." In brief the Committee pointed out, as its successors have repeatedly emphasized since, that scholars and teachers and the institutions in which they do their work are intended to serve the public, that it is the function of those responsible for the maintenance and administration of these institutions so to manage them that this service can be rendered in a maximum degree. While trustees and administrators have responsible functions in providing for the improvement and support of these institutions, and members of the faculties are their appointees, they are not the employees of these public agents. To quote the language of the Committee, "once appointed, the scholar has professional functions to perform in which the appointing authorities have neither the competency nor moral right to intervene." "The responsibility of the university teacher," the Committee continued, "is primarily to the public itself, and the judgment of his own profession; and while, with respect to certain external conditions of his vocation, he accepts responsibility to the authorities of the institution in which he serves, in the essentials of his professional activity his duty is to the wider public to which the institution itself is morally amenable. . . . A university is a great and indispensable organ of the higher life of a civilized community, in the work of which the trustees have an essential and highly honorable place, but in which the faculties hold an independent place, with quite equal responsibilities, and in relation to purely scientific and educational questions, the primary responsibility." In all "domains of knowledge," the Committee observed, "the first condition of progress is complete and unlimited freedom to pursue inquiry and publish its results. Such freedom is the breath in the nostrils of all scientific activity." A similar freedom, the Committee maintained, is essential for the

teacher, who must have "no mental reservation. He must give the student the best of what he has and what he is."

The obligation of the "university as a whole," the Committee reasoned, is "to the community at large," and it may thus sometimes become the duty of trustees and administrators to protect the faculty from "the dangers connected with the existence in a democracy of an overwhelming and concentrated public opinion." It was agreed that public opinion is "the chief safeguard of a democracy," but at times it may also be a "menace to the real liberty of the individual." An "inviolable refuge should be found in the university" from "such tyranny."

If it is "inadmissible that the power of determining when departures from the requirements of the scientific spirit and method have occurred should be vested in bodies not composed of members of the academic profession," it follows, the Committee was convinced, that "university teachers must be prepared to assume this responsibility for themselves." This obligation would "doubtless" seem to many to be "unwelcome and burdensome." To discharge it properly, members of the profession would "perhaps need to acquire in a greater measure" than they then had it "the capacity for impersonal judgment in such cases, and for judicial severity when the occasion requires it." But the profession would have to undertake this responsibility if it hoped to maintain its freedom.

Accepting this challenge, the Association has had to learn by experience how to fulfill the obligations implied. Under the circumstances its primary sanction has been the support of an informed public. Consequently it has had to proceed carefully, to be sure of its facts, to have faith that in the long run the public will support its own interest. It was soon clear that more rapid progress could be made by seeking the cooperation and support of organized administrators than by antagonizing them. By this means it is possible to speak with greater weight and effect to an administrator who departs from approved principles of behavior.

V

The advantage of agreement upon a joint statement of these principles by the Association and other groups concerned was

apparent. Many institutions had no stated practices or procedures concerning tenure. An attempt to procure the independent formulation of such statements by each institution would have involved endless difficulties and a wide diversity of statements in many cases not touching the substance of the issues involved. In cooperation with the Association of American Colleges, in a considerable degree as a result of the leadership of the late Dr. Tyler, and on the call of the American Council on Education, a conference was, therefore, held at Washington and the now familiar statement promulgated in 1925. After testing this statement through a decade of experience, this Association and the Association of American Colleges held a further series of joint conferences resulting in the statement promulgated in 1940.

Other interested groups, for example, the American Association of Teachers Colleges, have approved of these statements of principles, and to an increasing extent the Association has had the support of various accrediting associations in its efforts to see that these principles are observed. Perhaps we have a right to anticipate that the tendency of these organizations of administrators to cooperate with this Association may grow, considering the number of members of the Association who accept appointments as administrators.

It is unreasonable to expect, however, that the time will ever come when executives and administrators, no matter how genuine their interest, will be able to protect freedom and tenure without the support of scholars and teachers. It is an important function of the educational executive or administrator to mediate between the organized political, economic, and popular elements in society on the one hand and the academic community on the other. A considerable part of his energy has to be devoted to the interpretation of the problems of higher education to these groups to whom he is primarily responsible. One criterion of success is his ability to win and keep their support. He is thus naturally influenced by views prevailing among these groups. Were that not so, executives and administrators should not be expected to maintain for teachers and scholars conditions with which they do not seriously concern themselves and which they do not exert themselves zealously to guard. Finally, the executives and adminis-

trators disposed to maintain freedom and tenure will do it more willingly and successfully if supported by a strong organization of teachers and scholars concerned to accept a due share in the responsibility of seeing that their own obligations to the public are fulfilled.

The American Association of University Professors has always appreciated the necessity of maintaining a high standard of preparation and performance among members of the profession if society is to be expected to support the security and freedom necessary for scholars. It has always favored the exclusion of the unfit from the profession, though it has carefully insisted upon procedures designed to make sure as far as possible that incompetence is not alleged where other factors are primarily involved in cases of dismissal. The dismissal from their posts of men and women with considerable training and experience, who have invested a substantial span of their lives in the profession and in whom society has a similar outlay, ought to be attended by a careful procedure and supported by overwhelming evidence. A more constructive way to raise the standards of the profession, emphasized in the statement promulgated in 1940, is to exercise great care in making appointments and in the observation of appointees in their early years, while there is still time for them to find other employment and before either they or society have made too many commitments. Later there is no remedy for mistakes made at this stage which is not apt to involve both personal tragedy and social waste.

The necessity that scholars and teachers have the cooperation of executives and administrators and in some degree of the trustees of institutions in which they work if freedom and tenure are to be maintained should preserve the Association from the temptation to become a pressure group, primarily concerned with the personal interests of its members. If the profession is to claim successfully economic security and freedom for its members on the basis of service rendered to the public, it must of necessity seek the understanding and support of the responsible agents of the public without indulging in threats of force. Being under equal obligations to all groups in society, scholars and teachers cannot afford to associate themselves with any one to the exclusion of others. They cannot use either the methods or the point of view of a trade union.

Nor is the Association, on the other hand, precisely analogous to the organizations of other professional groups such as physicians, lawyers, or engineers. Members of these professions are largely free to seek individual clients and to adapt the services rendered and the resulting emoluments to the attendant circumstances. Not so scholars and teachers attached to universities and colleges. They are stipendiaries of society, who require a dependable source of modest income and freedom from extraneous interference if they are to render the services expected. Furthermore, they depend upon the institutions to which they are attached to afford them both the material means wherewith to do their work and access to selected youths in whom to inculcate their own acquisitions of knowledge and insight.

Should the responsible governors of society ask why scholars and teachers may not be called to account for their obligations in the same manner as other public employees, the answer is plain and unequivocal. Scholars in the field of higher education have it as one of their duties to examine critically prevailing habits of thought and action with full freedom to explore hypotheses that run counter to things currently accepted. Society profits greatly by this habitual testing in search of truth. But those who suggest radical departures from common views on any question of importance run the risk of arousing fears that may create antagonisms imperiling their appointments. Unless society provides insurance against this risk it is apt to lose the full measure of honest inquiry necessary to secure the maximum results from scholarship. It is thus in the public interest for scholars to have their appointments secure and their freedom absolute in the field of their scholarship.

VI

Professional scholars and teachers clearly have many problems and obligations peculiar to themselves to which they ought to give common attention. Perhaps they delayed too long forming an organization for that purpose. Few acquainted with the facts will think that they are yet fully aware of the need. One obstacle in the way of the development of an organization to act responsibly for the profession as a whole is the separate existence of the

learned groups in which scholars and teachers are associated on the basis of their interests in kindred subjects. These associations occupy so much of the attention of the more successful members of the profession that they hinder somewhat the growth of interest in the common problems. Some members engage in annual debates with themselves on the question whether or not the accomplishments of the more comprehensive association justify the modest dues required to support it. The fact of this questioning is sufficient evidence of the lack of general acquaintance with the work of the Association, frequently among those who unconsciously have materially benefited therefrom. Perhaps there is no immediate remedy for this difficulty, since a vital part of the work of the Association, from its nature, has to be done by the comparatively small group whose members appreciate the factors involved and are willing to take the time and to accept the responsibility for action.

Some have suggested that, since all education is a common task, teachers of all grades from the elementary schools through the universities should be associated in a single strong organization. Such an association might exercise a formidable influence in the United States, but that it would in all respects promote an ultimate public benefit is questionable. An overwhelming part of the educational task in its earlier phases is the indoctrination of youth with accepted habits, skills, traditions, knowledge, etc. True, as the pupil matures he is gradually encouraged to subject the things taught to some degree of critical examination. But the burden of the task in the earlier years is to implant that which is generally agreed upon. Scholars and teachers engaged in instructing more mature youth, on the other hand, have the duty of inculcating along with further knowledge the habits and methods of criticism, of stimulating the quest for truth and improvement. Thus both the methods of instruction and the conditions of work in the institutions of higher learning are different from those faced by teachers of the more elementary branches. It is consequently doubtful that either group of teachers would benefit greatly by more intimate association with the other.

That the academic profession needs to make more diligent efforts toward self-improvement and to cultivate the habit of

criticizing itself constructively needs no elaboration. Unless it does so it will not deserve to retain in the trying years ahead the measure of public confidence it has already won. This Association should in the future continue with increased zeal the activities toward these ends begun with some promise in the past. Perhaps its committees should strive to arrive at findings more immediately practicable than has sometimes been the case. But from the nature of their work social change attributable to scholars and teachers will always be gradual. Suggestions coming from academic halls of sudden and radical departures from current practice are not likely to find public favor.

One of our weaknesses in the past, however, has been a too frequent tendency to excuse our own failures and shortcomings as the fault of the auspices under which we work. It was appropriate that we study critically, as we have done recently, the current machinery of organization of higher education. Doubtless it is susceptible of improvement and ought to be improved. Meanwhile it is our primary duty to try to make it work as well as possible, and it is a common observation that poor machinery operated with cooperative good will by those intimately concerned achieves more than better machinery in the hands of rival groups, each primarily concerned with its own interest.

VII

A subject to which scholars and teachers might profitably devote further sympathetic study is the undergraduate college as it has developed in the United States. The vocation of most of them compels them to work in it, yet in many respects they do not approve of it. Some executives and administrators responsible for its direction advocate making it into something much different from what it has come to be, and busily seek a formula for its improvement. They should be left free to pursue the quest. I easily understand the nostalgic longing of men my age and older for the return of a curriculum which could largely be imposed upon a receptive youth in the confident expectation that he would emerge having some acquaintance with the best the past had to offer. But even younger teachers and administrators now grope for a clear path to this lost goal, seldom concealing their fears that

whatever is meant by a "liberal education" will be lost to the future unless we somehow hit upon a device to retrieve it.

I am uncertain whether on this question I am a pessimist or an incurable optimist. I have little faith that the magic hundred books will ever be found or, if they are, that the youths destined to community leadership will be induced in their collegiate years to read them all. For more than a generation I have worked and disputed with colleagues while tinkering with a curriculum. Perhaps I may be fated to do so to the end of my days. But I shall not be greatly surprised if many of the questions we ask so frequently remain unanswered, and I scarcely expect our problem ever wholly to be solved. Yet I do not anticipate that liberal education will pass from the earth as long as it contains genuine scholars in any field disposed to transmit to the succeeding generation that which they think they have learned along with the questions they have asked but cannot answer.

Perhaps one trouble is that those who pay the tuition and the taxes which support the undergraduate colleges expect services and have plans for them more comprehensive than ours. Making due allowance for the partiality of parents for their children, perhaps those who send us their sons and daughters in such large numbers and with such hopeful insistence know in their hearts that many will return without important elements of the liberal education we naturally and properly think it our chief mission to impart. They might not on that account agree with us that we ought by some device to exclude from these institutions entirely or at an early stage all who are unlikely to distinguish themselves by creditable achievement. A part of the freedom they seek for their offspring is the privilege of residing for a little space in their awakening years amid surroundings where the gates are opened toward the Jerusalem of whatever liberal arts and sciences there are. It may not be easy to convince this public which contributes so largely to our support that their children ought to be deprived of this privilege.

Some institutions have the policy of excluding all those who do not give promise of high scholastic achievement and congratulate themselves on having the freedom to do so. Many more find it expedient to accept the droves of aspiring youths who present

themselves en masse, to offer a wide variety of curricula, and to enforce only a minimum of attainment. Amid their overcrowded campuses, they may take some consolation in the thought that the talented who are ambitious to travel the long road to scholarship and learning will without much difficulty find the direction and the facilities they seek. Those who aspire to a profession or other vocation requiring knowledge or special skill will usually in any case follow well-beaten paths. As for the more numerous remnant, who frequently move on from the manipulation of the affairs of their fellow-undergraduates to a share in the tasks of managing business enterprises, the local community, the state, or the nation—perhaps they too had meat to eat during their four years of residence on the campus of which most members of the faculty were unaware. If the memories they cherish from these important years are not always such as may be revealed by a comprehensive examination or the contrivances of the professor of tests and measurements, it does not follow that the expenditure of their own time, the trouble they caused the faculty, the outlay by their parents and the public are wholly without recompense.

Peradventure there is something of social gain in having future scholars, members of the professions, and community leaders of whatever sort spend their last youthful preparatory years in a collegiate life which obliges them to some degree to mutual acquaintance. Even mature scholars, tempted to regard as an intrusion the presence of some of these youths in their cloistered preserves, may find compensations in the end in being thus obliged to be a part of the world they are engaged to serve. It sometimes transpires that those who in college penetrated few of the mysteries of the sciences or the arts are later charged as trustees with the management of the affairs of institutions of higher education. It is well to have in these positions of trust those who know by close observation if not by actual experience of the existence of values they may have been unable or unwilling to share. When learning is attacked by unscrupulous demagogues it may prove helpful to have leaders at hand who from personal knowledge can defend as harmless eccentrics professors and scholars accused as dangerous radicals.

But this is too long a digression from the point that the Asso-

ciation, notwithstanding its creditable achievements, still has much more to do in promoting a sense of professional responsibility among its members if it is to succeed in maintaining conditions that will enable them to do their best work. We can view the history of the past thirty years with justifiable pride, but if the interpretation here given is correct, the most substantial part of this achievement has been the establishment of agencies and the accumulation of experience which ought to lead to greater accomplishments in the future.

Whether this will prove to be the case will be for some other historian to recount a generation hence. It is the misfortune of one who writes an historical essay concerning an institution which has not concluded its work that his story lacks a dramatic climax. He can only conclude: Thus far have we come; we hope and trust that the best is still to be.

PROUD SPECIALISTS IN FREEDOM

By DENHAM SUTCLIFFE

Harvard University

In the eighteenth century it was a common remark that "When a man destitute of feeling is fit for no other purpose in society, he may make a tolerable hangman." The twentieth century would add, "... and if he can't be that, let him be a professor." It is safe to say of the populace as a whole that they have only the vaguest sense of what a professor is like and what he stands for. What the movies tell them we know well enough—Gary Cooper's *Ball of Fire*, for example. If popular fiction and the screen do not represent the professor as an arid pedant, something out of this world, then they make him an ineffectually benign old gentleman, very much in need of a guardian and a haircut. Everybody knows variations on the story of the professor who dreamed that he was lecturing to his class. He woke up and discovered that he—was. If the myth of the absent-minded professor is trite—as indeed it is—it is nevertheless so strong that Congress can forbid some administrative agencies to employ professors.

As every teacher knows, there is nothing new in this popular misunderstanding, for the teacher has been a butt of ridicule from the pedagogue of the Greek drama to the buffoon of the modern screen. William Hazlitt thought it great praise to say of Montaigne that "He does not converse with us as a pedagogue with his pupil, whom he wishes to make as great a blockhead as himself." Bliss Perry found for his autobiography an apposite remark in Scott: "May God forgive me for thinking that anything can be made out of a schoolmaster." The bookfull blockhead is a common figure in our literature and folklore, nor is it very surprising that in a practical world, where every man likes to see the concrete results of his labor and expense, the teacher should seem to be an essentially impractical man. The professor of Greek who

cannot change a tire is an easy mark for the wit of those who can do little else.

More and more we concentrate our admiration upon the men who "get things done." The executive and the "go-getter" are standard lay figures in our picture of the ideal world. We want a great bustle and dash, a dignity of dramatic action. In such a scheme of values it is hard to find a place for the teacher. Everyone realizes the significance of the physician's task—the arduous preparation, the full drama of life and death. His deeds are tangible, dramatic; fine matter for fiction and the screen. The lawyer is not much less interesting to the popular imagination. But few have yet found drama in the picture of a teacher who sits in his study correcting endless stacks of papers till his eyes are gritty and his nerves are ragged. What is heroic or dramatic about the man who sits comfortably at a desk badgering a desolate freshman?

The teacher does nothing—that seems to be the opinion. He already knows, or pretends to, all the answers. He simply goes to the classroom and asks questions for two—or three—hours a day for nine or ten months in the year. He is, in short, a pampered and easy-lived individual, a luxury in the state. His years of preparation are not exciting or even noticeable to anyone else; his miserable sweating over problems of procedure must never be allowed to appear in the classroom or elsewhere. No one says very much, nor cares, about his particular sacrifices, for they are not dramatic. Conduct which is accepted as normal in the lives of other men is often thought moral turpitude in his. His political opinions, his choice of friends and of entertainment, his domestic affairs—all these are public property for comment and reprobation. Words and acts that would pass unnoticed in another man's career can end the teacher's. But, as I say, none of this is dramatic, the ends to which it is done are not sharply defined, and it all happens very quietly and unobtrusively.

II

What is much more alarming, however, than this perennial misunderstanding and ridicule of teachers is the current shame of teachers themselves. Infected with the passion for "practical"

results of labor, we feel useless and only moderately decorative unless we are engaged in something besides teaching—writing articles such as this one or acting as consultant to a manufacturer of shoe polish. Only on passports and income-tax forms do we plainly label ourselves “teacher.” Elsewhere we speak of ourselves as “economists,” “historians,” “biologists,” as if we were ashamed of being teachers. And, indeed, many do seem to be openly contemptuous of the teaching process. A young teacher remarked to me not many days ago, “I’m finding out what happens to a teacher. They told me that after a while you get more interested in your students, more conscientious about preparations and grading, and before you know it you haven’t any time for your own work.” The young man is travelling in good company. A few years ago, when the late Stuart Sherman was invited to leave the University of Illinois for Amherst, his friend Paul Elmer More encouraged the change, saying, “Don’t stay out there and sink into being a damned professor.” Research and “productiveness” are so much esteemed and, in the larger colleges, promotion so much depends upon them that Bernard Schilling of Grinnell could say in these pages that “the conscientious performance of his actual duties as a teacher may be a disadvantage to a man professionally.” More and more the actual process of teaching is left to the young men. The older teachers inhabit the library or the laboratory and emerge occasionally—“at the pleasure of the instructor”—to give a lecture. Meanwhile their examinations are read by an assistant, their conferences are held by an assistant—who is himself eagerly awaiting the day when his list of published articles will promote him from the “drudgery” of the classroom to the dignity of a professorship.

What has become of the pride with which Comenius spoke of teachers when he described them as “select persons, conspicuous for their knowledge of affairs and their soberness of morals?” Are we afraid of being anything quite so vague, stuffy, and impractical as that when we can be “the eminent authority on socio-metrics?”

Some very good men have spoken out for the teacher’s influence. “The teacher affects eternity,” said Henry Adams, “he never knows where his influence stops.” Henry Brougham, who was not himself a pedant, thought teachers more important than

armies: "Let the soldier be abroad if he will; he can do nothing in this age. There is another personage—a personage less imposing in the eyes of some, perhaps insignificant. The schoolmaster is abroad, and I trust to him, armed with his primer, against the soldier in full military array." Yet no amount of such dignified assurance will overcome the teacher's present sense of futility, which has been increased a thousandfold by the war's sudden demand for every man's practical efforts. Let a military official speak of the teacher's contribution to the war and the teacher feels as proud as, in the 'twenties, God was supposed to feel when a scientist professed his faith.

III

I frequently ask my students, "What do you propose to make your profession?" The ineffectuals answer limply, "Oh, I dunno. Guess I'll just teach." I never hear a student speak in that tone about medicine or law or the church. Is it because the physicians, the lawyers, the priests have created a profession within which a man may be proud? If they have, it is because they themselves know what is their function, because they exercise it, and because they are proud to exercise it. Many reasons may be suggested for the professor's lack of pride; not the least known and felt among teachers themselves is their deplorably low income in proportion to their years of preparation and the nature of their work. But there is a more fundamental reason yet, and it is a simple one. Professors don't know what they're doing.

Too few of us are free men of the sort we propose to create by the process of liberal education. "Free" has come to have merely a political significance, but that meaning is only partial. A man politically free is yet a prisoner if he is bounded within the limits of a narrow vocational cave. If the Thracians have gods, said Thales, they will have them red-haired and blue-eyed; if the lion has a god, he will make him roar. Quite so; and if the insurance salesman has an ideal society in mind it is one in which all will cry with him "let sales be unconfined." Dr. Johnson's love of London impelled him to an eloquent passage wherein he described to Boswell the many views of London that might present

themselves to various visitors. The merchant would see it as the world mart, an architect as a great museum of the best and worst of his profession, a social butterfly as the heaven of bliss. But we recognize each of these visitors as in some degree the prisoner of his own capacities. Our ideal free man would see the parts, but he would see more—the meaning of the whole.

Liberal education is concerned with that free man, not primarily with the potential grocer or dentist or judge. Yet we who profess to be most able to develop the free man in our students are ourselves too much bound within the limits of our "fields" [a metaphor, by the way, that ought forever to be expunged from this journal] to see the whole. There is a man over in the physics department—I don't know who he is—who invariably keeps his classes five minutes after the bell; as a result, stragglers break up my golden sentences all through the first quarter of the class hour. I fume, to be sure. But it makes me wonder how many of us, in our imprisoned absorption in our subjects, do not "hold over" the mind and spirit of our student in a much more heinous sense, using our "material" not to free him but to capture him. The rancorous debate over liberal and vocational education which now fills our trade journals derives very largely from our own vocational insularity; out of our priggish conviction that from our particular seed of knowledge will grow the whole garden of wisdom. One might expect that from a *mere* mathematician or linguist or engineer; I am dismayed to find it in a *teacher*. If we can honestly understand that we are not competing as biologists, historians, physicists, theologians, but are instead cooperating as teachers, we can begin to do our proper jobs and take our proper pride in them. We can put a stop to the puerile bickering between the departments of natural science and of humane studies that now disfigures so many a faculty meeting, and we can undertake once more the prime job of educating for freedom instead of training for imprisonment.

IV

For that task, however, we need professional pride as teachers. It may be, even, that we need ability as teachers. As Stuart Sherman wisely said, "The purpose of teachers [he was

speaking specifically of teachers of English, but his remark is generally true] should be to add to the sum of human knowers rather than the sum of human knowledge." We are first of all curators and propagators of knowledge; our professional competence and pride should rest not alone in our possession of knowledge but as well in our ability to communicate it. Of course we shall carry on our research, and of course we shall applaud the colleague who "produces." But we shan't be happy if he offers that as a substitute for inspiring young people with a desire for knowledge, a sense of taste, and a regard for virtue. Teaching ought to be a vocation in the highest sense of that debased word. As Whitehead says, "The art of education is never easy; it is a task worthy of the highest genius. It is the training of human souls."

Souls are out of fashion just now, and any man who should respond to a question about his work by saying "I train human souls" must expect to be laughed at. The world would find more sense in it if he trained seals. We seem to have been doing something not wholly unlike that. We train writers of advertising, hotel managers, accountants, efficiency experts, book reviewers, and playground supervisors in profusion, but we get furiously angry when our growing mass of critics ask when we are going to get back to our job of educating men. There is something so frightfully medieval in such questions. And so obtuse. For how can a man who earns his living in such a vague and intangible fashion feel important in the midst of personnel managers, writers of best-sellers, and the producers of comic strips?

We have tried, therefore, to make a sunny place for ourselves as anything but teachers. After all, teaching is a lonely job and an obscure one. Make a better mousetrap and the world will know it; it can measure and will applaud your skill. Make a better man and the world will say he did it himself. Even that occasional appreciative student will feel the same way when his formal education is far enough behind him to be no longer a stumbling block. Yet our pride as teachers should find its home in the reflection that we have helped to produce a free man. It will not, of course, so long as we too join popular worship of the mousetrap; so long as we aspire to be not good teachers but

authorities on the history of the Church in the last quarter of the first half of the late Merovingian period.

Whether that pride must express itself in a devotion to academic titles, as Dr. Withers suggested in the February issue of this *Bulletin*, is with me a not very important matter. I shall be more pleased when as specialists in freedom we have created for ourselves a professional competence and pride that can laugh at the common pattern of conversation:

"What do you do?"

"I teach."

"Oh."

The tone of that "Oh" does not reside in printer's ink. Need it?

THE HUMANITIES IN AN ABSOLUTIST WORLD¹

By ROSCOE POUND

Harvard University

Man's significant achievement is civilization, the continual raising of human powers to a higher unfolding, a continually increasing mastery of, or control over, external or physical nature and over internal or human nature. Civilization is an accumulative activity. Both its aspects, control of physical nature and control of human nature, are added to from generation to generation and the whole is an accumulation of ages. In the present, the progress of control over physical nature, of harnessing external nature to man's use, has been so rapid and has been carried so far beyond what had been taken to be the limit of human powers, that it has all but blinded us to the other side, the control of internal nature. But in truth the two are interdependent. It is the control over internal or human nature which has made possible the division of labor by which the harnessing of physical nature has been made possible. If men were subject to constant aggression from their fellows, if they could not safely assume that they could go about their daily tasks free from attack, there could not be the experiment and research and investigation which have enabled man to inherit the earth and to maintain and increase that inheritance. The accumulation from generation to generation would be dissipated if it were not for the check upon man's destructive instincts which is achieved through accumulated control of internal nature. But the control over external nature relieves the pressure of the environment in which man lives and enables the accumulated control over internal nature to persist and increase.

In the history of civilization the outstanding period, from the standpoint of control over internal nature, is classical antiquity,

¹ Reprinted from the *Classical Journal*, Vol. XXXIX, No. 1, October, 1943.

the Greek-Hellenistic-Roman civilization, which happily kept no small degree of continuity during the Middle Ages, and was revived at the Renaissance. This period is as marked for one side of civilization as the nineteenth century and the present are likely to be held in the future for the other side. Indeed, the civilization of ancient Greece, carried on in the Hellenistic era and established for the world by the organizing and administrative genius of the Romans, is a decisive element in the civilization of today.

Art, letters, oratory, philosophy, history writing are an inheritance from the Greeks. Law, administration, politics are an inheritance from the Romans. The Greeks even worked out the field tactics to which the military science of today has reverted. Greek and Latin are a preponderant element in the languages which derive from Western Europe. Thus they enter decisively into our thinking, writing, and speaking, and thus into our doing. The last of the Caesars fell a generation ago. But the principles of adjusting human relations and ordering human conduct worked out in theory by Greek philosophers and made into law by Roman jurists of the days of the first Caesars govern in the tribunals of today. Latin was the universal language from the establishment of Roman hegemony and of Roman law as the law of the world for at least nineteen hundred years. All modern literature in all languages is full of allusions to the classics; of allusions to persons and events and stories out of the poets and dramatists and historians of Greece and Rome. One who knows nothing of the great authors of antiquity is cut off from the great authors of the modern world as well. To take but one example, a generation which grows up without any one knowing Horace, has missed something irreplaceable. To cease to teach the classics is to deprive the oncoming generation of opportunity of fruitful contact with a decisive element in the civilization in which it is to live. A generation cut off from its inherited past is no master of its present. "What men do is conditioned by the materials with which they must work in doing it. On one side of our civilization these are for the most significant part materials bequeathed to us by the Greeks and the Romans.

But we are told that we are entering upon a new era. The past is to be canceled. We are to begin with a clean slate. Our accumulated control over external nature has gone so far that there re-

mains only the task of making it available for universal human contentment. Then there will be no occasion for control over internal nature. The causes of envy and strife are to go with want and fear. Mankind will settle down to a passive enjoyment of the material goods of existence and will neither require nor desire anything more.

There are abundant signs of a significant change from the ideas and ideals and values which governed in the immediate past. It is not, however, a change to something wholly new. It is largely a reversion to something with which the student of classical antiquity is well acquainted; to modes of thought against which Socrates argued with the Sophists, about which Plato and Aristotle wrote in founding a science of politics, about which Stoics debated with Epicureans, which Christianity put down, for a time at least, when it closed the skeptical and Epicurean schools of philosophy.

II

Whatever the confident self-styled advanced thinkers of today may be looking forward to, the immediate actual result is a cult of force. We seem to be listening again to Thrasymachus, who argued that the shepherd protects the sheep in order to shear them for wool and slaughter them for mutton, and in the same way the political ruler protects the governed in order to be able to despoil them. The Sophists are coming into their own in ethics, and Machiavelli is hailed as a prophet in a realism which in law and in politics takes force to be the reality and those who wield the force of politically organized society, as the representatives of force, to be the actualities of the legal order and of the political order. A favorite phrase of the realist is "the brute facts;" a phrase used not in sadness that there should be such facts, but with a certain relish, as if brutality were the test of reality and the discovery of brute facts argued superior intelligence and discernment. In practice this makes force a test of significance. The significant things in the world are force and the satisfaction of material wants. Education must be shaped to the exigencies of these. Nothing else is to be taught or learned. Such a doctrine carried into practice, a régime to that pattern, would indeed give us a new world. But it would be new by reverting to a very old type.

Biologists tell us that what they call giantism in an organism is a sign of decadence. When the organism has developed to giant proportions, the next step is decline and the ultimate step is fall. In the same way, there are times in the history of civilization when things seem to have become too big for men to manage them. They get out of hand. The social order ceases to function efficiently. There is a gradual breakdown, followed after a time of chaos and anarchy by a gradual rebuilding of a social order, which in turn may develop a bigness beyond human powers of management and so break down. It may be significant that today the air is full of grandiose schemes for world organization.

The Hellenistic world was in such an era. The greater and richer part of the civilized world had been swallowed up in the empire of Alexander. An age of independent city-states was succeeded by one of great military empires ruled autocratically. Later, the Roman hegemony, in which, as it culminated in the Empire, every free man in the civilized world was a Roman citizen, the law of the city of Rome had become the law of the world, and all political authority was centralized in the first citizen of Rome, was another era of the same kind. It is significant that the first citizen of such a state became a military autocrat. The mark of thinking of such times is likely to be disillusionment. Epicureanism arose in the period of the successors of Alexander, and grew increasingly strong in the Hellenistic era. It thrived in the corresponding period of Roman history, the Empire from Augustus to Diocletian and Constantine. It was the most firmly intrenched of the Greek schools of philosophy, although it has contributed the least to the general progress of thought. It was so well fitted to a period of bigness and incipient decay that the Epicureans were the last school to give way before the rise of Christianity. When the schools of philosophy were abolished, they were the most widespread and tenacious of the anti-Christian sects.

Today, in another era of unmanageable bigness, we come upon tenacious give-it-up philosophies once more. Epicurus was wholly indifferent to the form of political organization of society. The real point in existence was to lead a happy life. If he lived under a wise ruler, the man seeking a happy life need have no fear of being disturbed. He could pursue a serene, untroubled exist-

ence. If the ruler was a tyrant, the wise man, like Br'er Rabbit, would "jes' lie low" and so escape the tyrant's notice and live an undisturbed life of happiness. Today what Epicurus put as happiness, current social philosophies put as security. The ideal is an undisturbed enjoyment of the means of satisfying material wants. Put concretely it seems to be a vested right in a life job with an assured maximum wage, fixed short hours, allowing much time for leisure at stated periods, a prohibiting of anyone from an over-activity which might give him an advantage, and compelling all to a regimented minimum exertion that would obviate the exciting of envy, and a guaranteed pension at the age of sixty, dispensing with the need of providing one's own reserve. This is the ideal existence Epicurus pictured—the condition of a happy life, the condition of perfect mental equilibrium, neither perturbed nor perturbable. In contrast, the last century identified security with liberty. Men sought security from interference with their activities. They sought to be secure against aggression so that they might freely do their part in the division of labor in a competitive economic order. They sought to be secure against governmental action except so far as was necessary to free them from aggressions of others. Now, instead of seeking to be secure against government, men expect to be made secure by government. But they expect to be secure in a new way; not to be secure in their activities but to be secure against necessity of activity, to be secure in satisfaction of their material wants with a minimum of required individual activity.

Very likely the change reflects the exigencies of a bigger and more crowded world. Possibly it is due in part to the development of luxury, leading to disinclination to the free competitive carving out of a place for oneself which the last century took for happiness. At any rate, freedom from worry about what one can achieve, renouncing of ambition to do things, and acceptance of political events as they may happen, go together as an accepted philosophy of wise living, as they did in the social philosophy of Epicurus.

Marxian economic realism has much in common with the Epicurean social philosophy. The static ideal of a happy life is to be attained as we get rid of classes. It is assumed that when property is abolished all competition between human beings will cease. Everyone will live undisturbed, without ambition, without envy,

and so freed from strife. Once the class struggle has been brought to an end, Marx looked forward to the same social ethical result as Epicurus. But there is nothing in the history of civilization or in experience of human relations in a crowded world to warrant such assumptions. We may be sure that after property is abolished men will still want and claim to use things which cannot be used by more than one or by more than one at a time. It is not likely that there will always be enough at all times of every material good of existence to enable every one at every moment to have or do all that he can wish, so that no contentions can arise as to possession or use and enjoyment. Nor is it likely in any time which we can foresee that there will be no conflicts or overlappings of the desires and demands involved in the individual life. Such ideas, however, seem to go with bigness such as the economic unification of the world has brought about in the present century.

III

Along with the disillusioned or give-it-up philosophies of such a time there goes a changed attitude toward government. Instead of wanting to do things, men want to have things done for them, and they turn to government to do for them what they require for a happy life. But they have no wish to be active in government. They turn to absolute political ideas. Eras of bigness and autocracy have gone together. Today while we all do lip service to democracy there is a manifest turning to autocracy. The democracy is to be an absolute democracy. Those who wield its authority are not to be hampered by constitutions or laws or law. What they do is to be law because they do it. They are to be free to make us all happy by an absolute power to pass on the goods of existence to us by such measure of values as suits them.

Such ideas of a happy life, and of politically organized society as the means of assuring that happy life, require an omniscient government. They require a government with absolute power to carry out the plan of an undisturbed life of serenity, free from all envy, want, or worry, by control of all activity no less than of all material goods. The restless must be held down, the active must be taught to keep quiet in a passive happiness, those inclined to question the economic order must be taught to accept the régime

of security in which their material wants are satisfied. Hence such a polity must of necessity take over education. Men are to be educated to fit into the régime of government-provided material happiness. Those things which will tend to achieve and maintain such a régime are to be taught. All else is to be given up. Either it will hinder the bringing about and making permanent of the new régime or it will tend to impair it when established. There is no place for any of it in the ideal régime.

Applied to international relations, the give-it-up philosophies must be wonderfully heartening doctrine for dictators. Applied to internal administration they are proving wonderfully heartening doctrine for bureaucrats. Can we doubt that a sense of helplessness in the Hellenistic era and again in the era of the later Roman Empire led to general acceptance of a philosophy that taught to let the government run itself or the governors run it in their own way? Can we doubt that a sense of helplessness in our time, a feeling of helplessness to make international relations conform to ideals, leads to acquiescence in theories of force; or that difficulty in an overcrowded world to make adjustments of private relations according to law achieve ideal results, leads to a theory of a law as simply a threat of state force and hence of law as whatever officials do in applying that force?

But if we are moved at times to feel helpless and give up to power and force, those who wield the force of politically organized society have no misgivings. They have supreme confidence that the omnicompetence of the state means the omnicompetence of the officials who act in the name and by the authority of the state, and are ready, assuming themselves to be *ex-officio* experts, to prescribe detailed regulations for every human activity.

We recognize such conditions when we look at them as they are manifest in the older parts of the world. We have not been prepared to see them as they have been developing gradually but steadily in our own polity. As a leader in American legal education has put it, it is simply a question of what we expect government to do. If we expect it to provide for all our wants by a benevolent paternal care and maternal solicitude, we must expect to surrender to it all responsibility and invest it—and that means those persons who carry it on—with all power. Such a régime is fostered by the

exigencies of war. But it was growing long before the war and independent of war conditions. The give-it-up philosophies were taught and preached before and apart from the war. They have been urged by a strong group in both English and American institutions of learning and are propagated today by teachers who advocate an unrestrained administrative power over liberty and property.

What is happening, what is to happen, to the humanities in such a time?

In this connection we must note another characteristic of the time, namely, distrust of reason. In this respect also the thought of today is akin to that of Epicurus. We are taught by the psychological realists that consciously or unconsciously men do what they wish to do and then justify what they have done by reasons conjured up by a desire to be reasonable, which nevertheless are not the real determinants of their behavior. Consequently, by not distinguishing reason from reasons, reason comes to be regarded as a mere name for specious justifying to oneself of what one desires to do and does accordingly. Reason is taken to be illusion. The reality is taken to be the wish, achieved by force or by the force of a politically organized society. This is brought out notably in the difference between the biographies of the last century and those of today. The biographies of the last century were taken up with what their subject did and how he did it. They assume that he had reasons for what he did which were consistent with his purposes and professions, and that his mistakes were due to miscalculation, unless the evidence constrains a different conclusion. The biographies of today are taken up with their subject's hidden motives; if not very creditable, so much the better as the biographer sees it. The evidence does not disclose the motives. The assumed motives interpret the evidence. If the biographer can show that George Washington's motives may be made out to have been not always very creditable, it only goes to show that his actions were after all merely phenomena and to remind us that it is unscientific to apply our subjective ideas of praise and blame to phenomena.

At any rate, we can find one powerful antidote to such teachings in the humanities, and it is perhaps for that reason that the advocates of so-called realism would suppress the teaching of them. At the beginning of the present century the German Emperor objected

to the education which, he said, trained the youth to be young Greeks and Romans instead of to be modern Germans. But the results of education to be Germans ought to give us pause if we think to make Americans by an education that seeks to make Americans to a pattern of a land given up to satisfaction of material wants provided by a régime of absolute government.

IV

But I hear people say, the aggregate of knowledge has become so vast that teaching must be confined to those things that count in the world of today. There are translations of the classics available in English and those whose interests lead them to explore the writings of antiquity can find what they seek in those translations. It is a waste of the time that must be given to the things of today to study difficult dead languages in order to find what translations have made accessible in modern languages. The time is needed for the natural and physical sciences, which teach us how to harness more of external nature to producing the material goods of human existence, and to the social sciences, which are to teach us how those goods are to be made to satisfy human desires. Here we have three fallacious propositions: (1) that education is only the acquisition of knowledge, (2) that even the best translation is or can be a substitute for the original of a classic, and (3) that the social sciences are so far advanced that we may rely upon them for objective judgments of the social order and of the problems and phenomena of ethics and economics and politics and jurisprudence. We have to learn the formulas of the social scientists as we once learned the formulated dogmas of the natural and physical sciences. Let us look at these propositions.

Knowledge as such is worth little without knowing how to use it. It is likely to be so up-to-date that it is out of date tomorrow. Discrimination, reasoned judgment, and creative thinking must work upon knowledge to make it fruitful. No one can approach a mastery of all the details of knowledge in even the narrowest field. But he can attain the wisdom that will enable him to lay hold upon those details when and where he requires them and to make something of them. Without this, the study of up-to-date subjects as merely so many tracts of knowledge is futile. Very likely the sup-

posed facts will have ceased to be so regarded by scientists as soon as they have been learned. The wise scholar, however, knows how to find them as they stand at the moment and appraise them for his purposes, and he can often do this although he approaches a subject in which he never had a formal course.

Wisdom is not gained by the use of translations. It is not acquired when students write confidently about Aristotle without having read or being able to read a line of him. It is not developed by slovenly use of language such as follows from never having been compelled to compare the same thought expressed in two languages and brought to see how different it may appear unless the translator is sure of the words no less than of the idea. What teacher of today has not seen confused thought bred of loose writing, due to lack of the disciplined use of words which is acquired by learning the languages from which even our scientific terminology is derived? What teacher has not encountered the type of student who wants to write a thesis on poetic usage and expects to use Pope's *Iliad* to show him the usage of Homer? Who has not met students of church history who cannot read the New Testament in the original, students writing on medieval philosophy and essaying to criticize a great thinker who cannot read a word of Thomas Aquinas in the tongue in which he wrote, students of legal history who cannot read *Magna Carta* as it was written, students of history who must take the significant historical documents at second or third hand? I have too often witnessed the pathetic struggles of would-be students of our legal history to handle the monuments of our law in the Middle Ages with no adequate grasp of the language in which they were written. I shall not soon forget the graduate student who thought he could read the Code of Justinian by the light of nature and was astonished to find that *conventus* did not, as he supposed, mean convent but meant agreement. Nor are such things confined to students. Who of us has not had occasion to feel for the earnest teacher who missed the fundamentals of his education in school and college and now is found struggling to gain what too late he perceives he sorely needs? A great injustice had been done to all of these by leading them to think they were acquiring an adequate foundation for what they desired to do, and leaving them to discover their mistake too late.

Even now, when the majority of those who go to our colleges have had some training in Latin, the teacher has learned to expect some almost incredible atrocities due to ignorance abetted by carelessness. In my last twenty years of law teaching I have become used to being told that in a proceeding *in rem* the *rem* must be before the court. I have ceased to be shocked when a college graduate tells me that *son assault demesne* is Anglo-Saxon, that *in pais* is Latin, and that *non compos mentis* is French. I can even keep a straight face when a law student, a college graduate, reading in the books about the doctrine of the Good Samaritan cases, asks me who the Good "Sarmatian" was. My friends in other lines tell me of the entomologist describing a new insect who thought *confluenta* was the feminine of *confluens*, or the botanist who wished to coin a word for "downward-directed" and with no knowledge of Greek consulted a Greek dictionary and coined *barithynetic*—I suppose for *katithynetic*. I have been told of a student of dramatics who spoke of "Andromash," and we have all heard "chaos" pronounced "chouse" and "Chloe" pronounced "Shlowie" by those who held degrees in arts. Those who perpetrate such things lack much more than a knowledge of the classical languages. They have failed to learn what to do with the materials with which they must work. We may be sure that these slovenlinesses will not be the only ones of which they will be guilty. But what will there be when no one who studies history or law or entomology or botany or dramatics knows any better? It won't do to say, for example, that a law dictionary will tell the law student what he needs. One must know something even to use a dictionary. When it comes about that no one is taught in his teachable years the languages and literatures which are at the foundation of what we say and write, our terminology in every branch of learning must become chaotic, and loose writing lead to loose thinking, and a general loss of morale in scholarship, of which we see abundant symptoms already today.

We are told, however, that those things which are not indispensable must in education in a democracy give way to those which are indispensable. As to this one must make three observations. In the first place, it assumes that democracy requires a common training for all, a training in the mechanic arts and the sciences

behind them, and in social sciences on the model of the physical sciences. No one is to be allowed an opportunity of development outside of this program of preparation for material production and politics. Secondly, it assumes that education is complete on leaving school, and hence that there need be no preparation for scholarly self-development of an element needed in any other than a stagnant or enslaved population. Third, it assumes that the social sciences are or can be such as the physical and natural sciences are; that ultimate truths as to economics and politics and sociology are impartible by teaching, and that knowledge of these truths is essential to a democratically organized people.

I have no quarrel with the social sciences. I am now in my forty-fourth year of teaching jurisprudence, and for forty of those years have taught it from the sociological standpoint. I have urged the importance of ethics and economics and politics and sociology in connection with law in forty years of law-school teaching. But I do not deceive myself as to those so-called sciences. So far as they are not descriptive, they are in continual flux. In the nature of things they cannot be sciences in the sense of physics or chemistry or astronomy. They have been organized as philosophies, have been worked out on the lines of geometry, have been remade to theories of history, have had their period of positivism, have turned to social psychology, and are now in an era of neo-Kantian methodology in some hands and of economic determinism or psychological realism or relativist skepticism or phenomenological intuitionism in other hands. They do not impart wisdom; they need to be approached with acquired wisdom. Nothing of what was taught as economics, political science, or sociology when I was an undergraduate is held or taught today. Since I left college, sociology has gone through four, or perhaps even five, phases. Indeed, those who have gone furthest in these sciences in the immediate past were not originally trained in them. They are not foundation subjects. They belong in the superstructure.

V

Notice how extremes meet in a time of reaction to absolutist political ideas. In an autocracy men are to be trained in the physical and natural sciences so as to promote material production.

They are to be trained in the social sciences so as to promote passive obedience. In an absolutist democracy men are to be trained in the physical and natural sciences because those sciences have to do with the means of satisfying material wants. They are to be trained in the social sciences because those sciences have to do with politically organized society as an organization of force whereby satisfaction of material wants is to be attained. As an important personage in our government has told us, the rising generation must be taught what government can do for them. The relegation of the humanities to a back shelf, proposed by the Kaiser at the beginning of the present century, has been taken over to be urged as a program of a democracy. Such ideas go along with the rise of absolute theories of government throughout the world. An omniscient government is to tell us what we shall be suffered to teach, and the oncoming generation is to be suffered to learn nothing that does not belong to a régime of satisfying material wants by the force of a political organization of society. It is assumed that there is nothing in life but the satisfaction of material wants and force as a means of securing satisfaction of them.

America was colonized in a similar period of absolutist political ideas—in the era of the Tudor and Stuart monarchy in England, of the old régime of which the rule of Louis XIV was the type in France, of the monarchy set up by Charles V in Spain, of the establishment of the absolute rule of the Hapsburgs in Austria. England of the Puritan Revolution shook these ideas violently and at the Revolution of 1688 definitely cast them off for two centuries. The colonists who came to America settled in the wilderness in order to escape them. When we settled our own polity at the end of the eighteenth century, we established it as a constitutional democracy, carefully guarded against the reposing of unlimited power anywhere. Moreover, these early Americans, because they did not believe in an omniscient government or superman rulers, set up institutions for liberal education. Within six years after their arrival in the wilderness in the new world, the founders of Massachusetts set up a college in order that there might continue to be a learned ministry after their ministers who had come from the English universities were laid in the dust. As our country expanded in its westward extension across the continent, state

after state in its organic law provided for a state university in order that liberal learning might be the opportunity of every one. It was not till our era of expansion was over and one of industrialization began that state institutions for mechanical education were more and more established. But these for a generation did not greatly disturb the humanities. The movement to displace them is a phenomenon of the era of bigness.

Outward forms of government are no panacea. We can't do better than we try to do. If we are content to lapse into a revived Epicureanism, if we are content to seek nothing more than a general condition of undisturbed passivity under the benevolent care of an omniscient government, we can very well leave education to the sciences which have to do with providing the material goods of existence and those which teach us how the government secures or is to secure them for us. If we are not content with being, as Horace put it, pigs of the drove of Epicurus, but seek to live active, human lives, even at some risk of envy and strife and wish for things unattainable, we must stand firm against projects which will cut our people off from the great heritage of the past and deny them the opportunity of contact with the best that men have thought and written in the history of civilization.

I cannot think that, when what is meant by the displacement of the humanities is brought home to them, the intelligent people of America will consent to bow the knee to Baal. I am confident that, as Milton put it, we shall be able to speak words of persuasion to abundance of reasonable men, once we make plain the plausible fallacy behind the idea of teaching only the indispensables, and that the physical and the social sciences are the indispensables. We can have a democracy without having a people devoted solely to production and consumption. Those who are fighting to preserve the humanities are working for a democracy that can endure. One which sinks into materialistic apathy must in the end go the way of the peoples which have succumbed to the perils of mere bigness in the past.

By ANDREW J. GREEN

Louisiana State University

The recent transfer of 110,000 A.S.T.P. students as privates to infantry units slated for combat duty must necessarily concern us as university teachers and administrators. Our proper function is not to keep our jobs or to keep the colleges going; it is to look after the development and efficient employment of intelligence in our democracy. The crisis of war increases rather than diminishes this responsibility; and we must be concerned when we fear that the army may put the best intellectual material to the worst possible use.

Whatever the history of the Army Specialized Training Program in its early stages, it was apparent after the final screening of the midwinter examinations that the 110,000 who then remained in our classes represented a higher level of potential and developed intelligence than has ever before been organized (that is, rendered as a body subject either to self-action or to direction) on so large a scale for any purpose.

Exact statistical figures demonstrating the marked superiority of A.S.T.P. men over the average college freshman can be presented only under the authority of an army release. These figures are based on psychological tests given to all college freshmen and to the A.S.T.P. men *before* the final midwinter screenings. If these figures are impressive, then figures for the A.S.T.P. men *after* the final screenings would certainly be compelling.¹

Figures for the performance of the A.S.T.P. men on the Army

¹ So far as the writer knows, they have not been compiled. Let us hope that they will be compiled and released as soon as possible.

By the term *A.S.T.P. men* as employed in this article is meant only the 110,000 who survived the final screenings and were then sent to troops.

This article does not intend to imply that all of the intelligent privates in the army were screened into the A.S.T.P. and only privates of average intelligence left. The extensiveness or the methods of the army's preliminary screenings are not known.

General Classification Test are likewise restricted. Hypothesis must therefore be substituted for facts known to inner circles only. But from a hypothesis (as from facts) a conclusion may be drawn. *If* the average A.S.T.P. man scores much higher on this test than officer candidates who pass with the minimum score, then some, or many—or perhaps most—A.S.T.P. men are now serving as buck privates under officers who by the army's own standards possess inferior brains and general ability.

But much more convincing to most of us than impersonalized figures is our own instructional experience. Are there any of us—is there one—who did not feel an emotion of pride in them as he faced the living human material of those final classes? When, if ever before, have brawn and brains been so perfectly blended, concentrated, and organized on so large a scale?

II

We do not know that this intellectual material is to be misused, but there are ample grounds for fear.

Upon dissolving the A.S.T.P. the army announced that "... the student soldiers are the type who can be expected to assume the responsibilities of noncommissioned officers and of skilled technicians. Around 80,000 of the men will be transferred to the Army Ground Forces where the skills and capacity for leadership are now most needed. Most of the remainder will be assigned to other units destined for overseas service. The policy will be to make certain that the skills and the qualities of leadership which these thousands of student soldiers possess are used on assignments where they can function most effectively."

Now one cannot demand that the War Department specify how many of these men have been given technical assignments suited to their abilities, or made staff sergeants, or admitted to Officer Candidate Schools, or how many more will be, or when. This is the unknown, the vacuum. But vacuums are dangerous. They are especially dangerous when general rumor is consistently confirmed by scraps of evidence, first from one quarter, then from another, and another, and another, indicating that the opportunities vaguely suggested by the army's statement are sufficiently limited to justify their being called chimerical. Letters from

A.S.T.P. men now scattered in army camps all over the country indicate the emptiness of O.C.S. promises and the impossibility of winning noncom ratings—in short, the blank wall A.S.T.P. men now face so far as transfer, advancement, or any effective use of their talents is concerned. A very few may go to noncommissioned officers school; a handful may serve as interpreters with the military police. But the number of those who may thus escape is extremely small.

Almost simultaneously with the abolition of the A.S.T.P. the air corps began closing its doors to air cadets. There is, we are told, a surplus of air cadets. This was an especially cruel twist for men who had passed the strict physical and exacting aptitude tests and had received the blessing of the air corps boards of review. Admissions to O.C.S. also had already been drastically curtailed. The Tables of Organization, not only of the army as a whole, but—what is most to the point—of those units to which A.S.T.P. men have been assigned, are now filled. The A.S.T.P. men have not been sent to organizing or to newly organized units; they have been sent to units whose organization is complete. Their chances for even a corporal's stripes are at present virtually nonexistent. The army has recently expressed appreciation of the value of the A.S.T.P. men, but no statement has been made as to how their special training is to be utilized. We have been told that the A.S.T.P. men are to be used as a reserve for replacements. What this means is that most of the A.S.T.P. men are serving as privates in units slated for combat duty.

Had the men only been left in the units to which by the casual chances of induction they were originally assigned—instead of being screened and screened into this splendid mass organization of intelligence and *then* returned to troops—most of them would have won for themselves admissions to the air cadets corps or to O.C.S., or promotions as noncommissioned officers in their then organizing companies. Wiseacres have remarked that the smart men flunked out of the Program long ago. The effect of the army's action has been to dupe the men into sweating at cosines and tangents and slide rules and retorts and military correspondence until promotions are no longer open to them. In peacetime one may be the best soldier in the army and yet remain a buck private

for ten years until the place immediately above him is somehow vacated. The A.S.T.P. man is not thrilled, we may be sure, by a prospect of more rapid promotion if the death of his superior occurs before his own.

III

The merely personal disappointment of the A.S.T.P. men, however, is worthy of notice only because it is an *organized* maladjustment. Even the fact that the army does not always employ intelligence efficiently may be passed over when the speed with which so vast an army was organized is remembered. For intelligence deserves no more favor from chance than does the rank and file. But it is another thing to see it carefully organized and then assigned to posts where it operates at its minimum efficiency and stands in its greatest danger of annihilation.

It is not self-evident that Smith with an I. Q. of perhaps 150 can wield or dodge a bayonet with fifty per cent more skill than Jones with an I. Q. of 100, or that he can sidestep a cannon ball or throw a hand grenade half again as quickly and accurately. Or that he can kill three Germans while Jones is killing two. Or that he stands a three to two better chance of survival. It is self-evident that he stands the same chance of losing his arm or his life to the casual bullet, for bombs and machine guns and artillery are no respecters of persons.

The 110,000 men who will go into the intensest spot of battle are 0.014—one and four-tenths per cent—of an army of 7,700,000. By the casual chances of induction and subsequent military assignment the number of Smiths (that is, of A.S.T.P. men) under the bombardment of the enemy would be to the number of Joneses as 1.4 to 100. Then intelligence would be bearing its due share of luck and chance and peril. But if the number of Smiths in the rain of shrapnel is to the number of Joneses as 110,000 is to 4,000,000 or to 2,000,000—as one is to forty, or as one is to twenty—then intelligence is bearing from fifteen to twenty-nine times its due share of danger.

Then America is risking the best of her young brains and the brightest promise of her future with wanton and reckless abandon. Then America is offering for decimation and double decimation

the organized and concentrated nucleus of her intellectual and spiritual resources. Then America is offering for reduction, with a fatuous disregard of justice, the small class from which she derives her most capable leadership.

The life of any American soldier is precious; but more sternly than a necessary proportionate sacrifice an unnecessary and disproportionate sacrifice of intelligence will be felt in every phase of our political, economic, social, cultural, and intellectual life. If fewer of these men, in proportion, return from battle alive and able-bodied, this one and four-tenths per cent will also bear fewer children, and time may show a discernible lessening in the level of American intelligence. We are not even in the position of selling our birthright for a mess of pottage. Like a lunatic in frenzy, we are throwing it away.

The effect of the army's final action has been to realize the exact antithesis of its initial object. The Program has, in fact, become inverted. It has gone topsy-turvy. The men have been denied opportunity to win promotion to places where with brain and brawn (regardless of danger) they could serve most ably. The army, after carefully determining and defining (by what was in effect the vicious screening process of which we have unwittingly been innocent instruments) its best ability, has determinedly placed that best at the point of least efficiency and greatest hazard.

This analysis hinges upon an unknown. That unknown is the army's real intent and its real *practice* in assignments to duty of these 110,000 men. The analysis may be wrong. But we do not *know* that it is wrong; and there are strong grounds for believing—all of what evidence is available points one way—that it is right.

If the analysis is wrong, the army can set our doubts at rest either by a precise and unequivocal pledge to fulfill before the 110,000 A.S.T.P. men are offered for organized destruction its statement that they will be given special assignments commensurate with their abilities, or by implementing that statement with convincing statistics. If the analysis is right, what can turn out to be the most wanton organized misuse of intelligence in history will not occur without a protest.

SHOULD ACCELERATION AT THE COLLEGE LEVEL BE CONTINUED AFTER THE WAR?¹

By JOHN W. NASON

Swarthmore College

Many today are advocating the continuation of the present accelerated program. Some of you may have seen the article by Allen W. Porterfield entitled "A College Degree in One Year."² By taking the standard year as extending from September 15 to May 31 and the average class "hour" as lasting only 50 minutes and the number of points or credits necessary for the degree as 128, Mr. Porterfield reduces the normal four-year program to 148 weeks. He then makes further deductions for Christmas and other vacations, for Sundays, for examinations, for absences, for extra credit based upon excellent work. In this way he squeezes the four "years" of college into 58 weeks or approximately one year. He concludes: "The two-term system, with its lapses into confusing inactivity and its gnawing deductions that can only be written off as so much cut-rate bargaining, is medieval in both historical origin and perpetual inefficiency."

Speaking directly for one institution only, but indirectly I believe for one type of institution, I stand in vigorous opposition to the position taken by Mr. Porterfield and give an unqualified negative answer to the question "Should Acceleration at the College Level Be Continued after the War?" It must be recognized, of course, that large universities and small colleges differ widely. The correct answer for one is not necessarily the correct answer for the other. Many middle western state universities have operated on a four-quarter system for many years, and I see no reason why they and other large universities should not continue on this basis. When it is a question of the small residential college, however, the arguments are against acceleration.

¹ Address presented on March 24, 1944 during Schoolmen's Week in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

² *School and Society*, March 4, 1944, Vol. 59, No. 1523.

II

There are two reasons why acceleration should not be continued after the war. It is too hard on the faculty and it is undesirable for the students. College and university faculties differ in that most residential colleges have only enough faculty members to cover the variety of subjects which the institution feels should be presented, whereas the large universities will have staffs which permit two, three, four, indeed sometimes ten and twelve classes or sections of the same subject. Consequently a full variety of subjects cannot be given by the small college unless all members of the faculty teach the year around. This is the best formula yet devised for exhausting the chief intellectual resources of an educational institution. There is no doubt that colleges and universities will end the war impoverished in this respect and that for two or three years after the war students will get a poorer education by virtue of the fact that faculty members are today living on their intellectual capital. If acceleration were to continue, colleges would either suffer a sharply increased cost of instruction or they would impose heavier teaching loads on members of the faculty either through the number of students in classes or in the number of teaching hours per week or in the number of weeks of teaching per year. It has been suggested that the increased cost of the additional faculty members is balanced by the additional fees paid by students for a third term or fourth quarter. This might be true for institutions which operate entirely on student fees. No way has yet been found for wringing an additional 33 per cent or 50 per cent out of the endowment funds. This means that the more highly endowed the institution the greater is the relative difficulty of financing an increased faculty commensurate with the increased teaching demands.

In the second place, continued acceleration is undesirable from the point of view of the students. The heavy strain of continuous work is not good for most students and is quite definitely bad for some. This affects women more than men, but even the latter show at times the strain of continuous application to education. Furthermore, students under the accelerated program do not

learn so much as under the older and more leisurely program. There is apparently a coefficient of intellectual absorption. There is intellectual fatigue, and the law of diminishing intellectual returns does eventually set in. To change my metaphor abruptly, the vacations serve as a period of intellectual gestation during which the ideas of the students mature slowly and sort themselves out in such a way that the student comes back to college not only refreshed but with a reasonably orderly mind.

Finally, there are real although intangible values in class organization. This is perhaps a peculiarity of the small residential college. While I realize how easy it is to overestimate the importance of extra-curricular activities, class loyalty, and the like, I am nevertheless convinced that there are real values in these aspects of undergraduate activities. Group solidarity is not to be disregarded. The sense of belonging is not unimportant. These add not only to the pleasantness of college life, but to the process of emotional growth which is so important during the years from 17 to 22. These factors play perhaps a less important part in a large university which has so many advantages over the small college. I should be reluctant to see the small college give up those features in which it can excel. This seems to me to be one. Acceleration has destroyed it in our colleges today and would continue to destroy it if we were to continue our present war-time program.

III

These are my arguments for giving a negative answer. Now let me look briefly at some of the arguments that are offered in support of acceleration. In the first place, it is held in some quarters that the time required for higher education is already too long. Students, it is said, must be through their education in order to start at an earlier age the business of earning their living. I admit the tendency of lengthening professional education. Lawyers are now 25 and doctors 28 on the average when they finish their formal education. Nevertheless, we live in an age of increasing specialization and technical proficiency, and

however much we may deplore the necessity of extending the period for education, it is inevitable. The financial argument can work both ways. If economic conditions after the war are harder, it can be concluded from this that parents will have even greater difficulty than before in paying 50 per cent more for the education of their son or daughter in any calendar year. If two semesters now cost \$1000, three semesters will cost \$1500. The *total* cost of undergraduate education may not increase, but it will fall into a smaller earning period. A considerable number of students have always needed the summer vacation in which to earn money with which to continue their education. It is doubtful whether this number will decrease in the postwar years.

In the second place, it has been said that society cannot permit to go idle for the summer months the enormous investment which it has in educational plants. The answer to this is to make use of the educational plant in the summer months. Colleges were already holding conferences and conventions during part of the time that they were in vacation. Some have held special sessions of one sort or another. If adult education is to increase as rapidly after the war as I believe it should, residential colleges could do something to facilitate this necessary development. The experience of all European countries which have pioneered in this field indicates that a period of residence is far more valuable for adult education than evening sessions or extension work.

Finally, it is argued that the long summer vacation is intellectually wasteful. I grant that for many of our students it has been so. It is not necessary to loaf for three or four months of the summer, however pleasant that form of life may be. It is important that we make better use of our summer "vacation" by integrating it with our academic work. How? We might establish special sessions for intensive language work of six or eight weeks in length. There is some evidence at present that this is the most efficient way of teaching modern languages, and it would have the advantage of freeing the first two years of college of elementary language instruction. We have had very successful experience at Swarthmore College with Quaker work camps, and I should recommend that more of our students go during their summer period to camps of this kind. There is not only the

value of manual work—and it is surprising how many of our students come from cities where they have never been taught to use their hands—but there is also the value of the different human relationships involved in an interracial project in a large city or a school building project in Mexico or a farm rehabilitation project in Nebraska. Our students at Swarthmore who have undertaken these ventures have come back not only emotionally but intellectually much more mature. There is also the extension of a practice which already exists in a summer trial in one's future occupation. Work experience for engineers, chemists, lawyers, and doctors is fairly obvious. Business training for economics majors can be valuable. Foreign travel for modern language students is, when possible, perhaps the best use of the summer. Students who want some day to write might try their hand at journalism. Students who hope to enter government service, and this is an increasing number, might have internships provided for them in city, state, or federal bureaus where they could learn firsthand the practice of what they study in principle in class.

What is important is that the summer period should no longer be disregarded in the total educational scheme. I do not believe that for many institutions the continued acceleration of the academic program is at all desirable. I do believe, however, that our past practices respecting the summer months have been wasteful and that we must integrate the nonacademic program of the summer with the work in college.

WANTED: 'A UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

By HORACE T. HOUF

Ohio University

Students are the reason for the existence of a university. Back of them is society, from which they come and into which they emerge as participants. What happens to the students during their years at the university determines the worth of the university. Other persons connected with the university are secondary; they are means to the prime objective, the educating and the training of students. This is the central, basic, incontrovertible reason for the existence of institutions of higher learning, whether they be colleges or universities and whether they be church-related or state-supported. The needs of students are the prime concern in all higher education. To underestimate this fact puts the entire perspective awry.

Organization, plant-equipment, and staff are means to that prime end. They are necessary as means, but may never rightfully usurp first place. The fact that they so easily and so often do usurp primacy is a major reason for our being ever alert and determined that they shall not. The instrumental place of buildings and equipment is obvious, although these are sometimes overstressed. The instrumental role of personnel, other than students, is not so obvious, and is too often not realized by those in authority whose business it is to select the administrators in higher education. Governing boards incline to feel that once they have chosen and empowered the supervisory heads of their institutions, the job is the same as all done. This is a large half-truth, which again must be seen with proper qualifiers.

In functional order, next to the students come the instructors. The faculty does the actual direct work with the students. "The miracle is performed in the classroom," as Dr. E. B. Bryan used to say. There the students are introduced to the main fields of learning, both theoretical and applied. There they get their

basal acquaintance with the various contents and methods. There they meet the challenge of new bodies of knowledge and catch the enthusiasm of their tutors. Average persons take the work in their stride, and superior students awaken to the adventure of learning and research. To them tutors become mentors, and learning becomes a passion. Personality and comradeship become uppermost in work and in worth.

Above the teachers, administratively, are the directors of schools and the deans of colleges. Over limited fields and groups of persons they have direction and authority. In matters of departments, courses, instructors, and administration within their domain, they may be expected to supervise and administer. And above them is the *president* of the institution. In the hierarchy he stands at the top. Most often he does not instruct students. Faculty members usually do not carry their questions and problems to him, at the first. Matters of departmental and college decision do not come to him until they have been first considered by director or dean. The president's relations with the students (who are the *raison d'être* of the university) are mostly effectuated through the stages of this mounting organization. There are other ways the president normally may influence his students, of course.

II

Thus far we have approached the higher educational enterprise from the functional viewpoint, emphasizing the students and those who minister to them. Another approach is from the view of society outside, which maintains the institution. From that angle, another responsibility of the president becomes apparent. Before students get to college their lives are mostly directed by their parents. During the secondary years that responsibility is shared by the persons active in directing public education. By the time students arrive at the university, guidance and control over them largely passes into the hands of university personnel. Those in charge at the university then stand *in loco parentis*. For the students they must do what the parents would but cannot. Doing this falls first upon the teachers. What they are and do largely determines what the university shall mean to

the young people. But the teachers work under provisions and regulations determined by those higher up. This applies to courses, equipment, and major emphases in content and method. It even applies, and most significantly, to the spirit in which all the work is done. In determining policy and procedures the deans are strategic; and back of them (or ahead of them) is the president. And back of the president are the trustees, who represent society (including the parents) in selecting and empowering the main administrators. Thus the students may be rightly served and the interests of society adequately promoted.

Against this background it is not hard to see what are the main responsibilities of the university president. For the sake of concreteness now let us have in mind a medium-sized state-supported university, with several thousand students and a few hundred instructors. (We shall be thinking of this kind of institution and not of a particular instance. As to individuals also, let it be understood that "any likeness here portrayed to any actual person, living or dead, is entirely coincidental," as the movies so faithfully remind us.) The type of institution and of administrator is the thing before us.

The president then is selected and empowered by the trustees to undertake two main things: to see that the students are well served by the university, and to promote the interests of society through the institution. Through the trustees the president gets his authority from society outside the institution. But his main objective is to have the students rightly served. The deans and directors are his first resource in getting policies and programs determined. Through them he guides and administers the entire staff. But final service is done only by the teachers who are at the front. The rôles of president, administrative group, and teaching faculty thus vary substantially, but are complementary and necessary. If this is clearly seen by all, and if each functions effectively with fairness to others, then the educational project gets the right results. If there is effectiveness and fairness both in work and in play, then the administration is likely to run smoothly and all will be as heartily on the job as it is possible for a few hundred humans to be.

This means the president must deal effectively with at least

three groups directly—with the trustees who represent the public, with the deans and directors who administer, and with the teaching faculty. In other ways also he must influence the student body, and the general public (in a public relations way), and the state legislature. These duties of the university president determine what sort of man he should be; and they also indicate certain temptations which should be scrupulously avoided.

III

A university president should be a personable individual, generally attractive. That will give him an initial advantage with all whom he must contact. He should have lived long enough to be mature and sensible in judgment. If that can be had in a young man, well and good. He should be sound in character and habits. That is not to say he should conform to narrow and provincial expectations, but that he should be a man of integrity, able and willing to meet the reasonable expectations of the community in which he works. He should not be "muscle-bound" as to ideas, procedures, and adaptability. His plans for the institution need not be conventional or timid.

Let him, by all means, have a philosophy of education, of university education, in which he believes and for which he stands (or works). Without that, the man is almost useless. Let that philosophy be articulate in the main points. Then let him "sell it" to associates and teachers. On it, let the policy and programs of the university be based. Thus, a current will flow through all that is done. And, whether all concerned are satisfied or not, progress can be seen and results adjudged. Let no man who has gone cold on university education, or has become blasé about life itself, presume to guide the work and destiny of a university where young people are being molded. That would be a sin against youth and a hurtful disservice to society. Let no man accept the rewards of the university presidency unless he has what it takes and will give more than he gets. Honesty, above all else, should be at the heart of this business.

As a first among equals the president should be a scholar. On his staff will be numerous teachers who know more of their subject than does he. That is to be expected and required. His ability

to plan, to sell his program to his colleagues, and to administer effectively is central. Since he will work among equals there should be no arrogance or fruitless conceit. Sufficient authority for him derives from his appointment by the trustees representing the public, and undue fussiness or fractiousness probably indicates some inward lack of sufficiency. There should be the dual ability to delegate some responsibilities and to accept and execute others. A too politic evading of final responsibility soon becomes apparent to all, and its demoralizing effects are inescapable throughout the institution. Since a university is a center of culture, it is not fitting that an administrator should behave like "the bull of the woods" (to use workingmen's slang). Neither should he, on the other hand, be too fine or timid and conciliatory. His judiciousness should not be such as to paralyze him. Decisions must be made; time counts; and not everybody can be pleased. The president must be able to reach decisions and get things done—on time. These are only some of the qualities needed by the university president. Every reader can think of several others. For our purpose these must suffice.

Then there are certain *pitfalls* the president should scrupulously avoid. As was said, he deals directly with three groups—the trustees, the administrative staff, and the teaching faculty. For making his work a success, he must depend staunchly upon his deans and directors, but most of all upon the teachers, since they service the "ultimate consumers." But the president may be overimpressed by the attitudes and opinions of his trustees. To them he owes his appointment and through them he has authority. Most probably they are business and professional men who have succeeded in their own fields—but have made no serious study of the philosophy and procedures of education. To them the situation is one of employer-and-employee. (Most of them do not realize that even into this relationship there has come over from the past a tincture of the psychology of master-and-slave.) The president is, for definable purposes, an employee of the trustees. Through the president, administrators and teachers also are "employees." That they are also (for the most part) gentlemen and scholars is a fact too easily overlooked or underesteemed. (At bottom, they are "hired men," as one trustee is known to

have remarked.) The trustees should not be allowed to forget that the faculty is made up of the most highly selected and specially trained persons they could find. The president is simply their administrative head for defined purposes. And the president, just because his bread is buttered on the trustees' side, should not surrender the dignity of his office or ignore the rightness due in every procedure he must take. As an educator, he is expected to guide and lead. The president should serve the trustees well by doing always what is best for the institution and its personnel, including students, teachers, administrators, and maintenance workers.

Then too a president may overindulge his administrative group at the expense of the teachers. To do that is to fall into another pit. Such group may be overenlarged, or it may be relatively overpaid. Or it may be unduly magnified in the university's functioning. Any of these disproportionate actions will induce misunderstanding and create friction. Such friction and misunderstanding is more easily induced than it is eradicated. The president belongs to the entire institution: not chiefly to the trustees, nor to the administrative group, nor even to the teaching faculty. Any notable imbalance or partiality in these relationships will substantially disrupt the work of the institution, will drop sand between the cogs of the educational machine, and will degrade morale inevitably. No! Let the president impartially, effectively, devotedly stand at the head of all. Let him see that every one does his proper part, and gets his fair reward, in serving well the students, who come first, always first, in the university.

Maybe the president should take a lesson from the wisdom of a humble pipe-organ pumper-boy of whom we heard. A noted organist appeared in a certain town to give an organ recital. The freckled lad crawled back beneath the organ and pumped air through the pipes. The audience heard only the music, and was thrilled. Periodically the performer would turn from his bench and say to the audience, "Now I shall play . . .," emphasizing always the "I." Finally the freckled, sweating lad poked his head up from beneath and said, "Sir, from now on, say *We*, or we won't play!"

POSTWAR LIBERAL EDUCATION—A DEMURRER

By W. L. WERNER

Pennsylvania State College

One may agree with every carefully phrased sentence in the report on "The Postwar Responsibilities of Liberal Education,"¹ and yet find it inadequate. The report deals with the immediate postwar problems and with basic, continuing problems. It presents an admirable analysis of the probable state of mind of the returning veterans and a brief analysis of the postwar needs of women students. It stresses the importance of formulating academic principles independent of private and governmental demands. It lists the skills developed by liberal education and the areas of knowledge "which a person must explore to be liberally educated."

Then, after this able and extensive analysis, the report presents four principal recommendations: (1) aptitude and achievement tests on entering college, (2) individualized instruction—the tutorial system and the use of source material, (3) expert counseling, and (4) achievement and comprehensive examinations at graduation.

Such proposals are not revolutionary. Indeed, they look not forward but backward to Oxford tutoring and the examinations of German universities. Entrance tests are already extensively used in American colleges, sometimes to check doubtful applicants, sometimes to separate students after entrance into different levels of instruction. Tutorial systems are also in effect in colleges that can afford them. Counseling arrangements and comprehensive examinations are a standard boast in many catalogues, and in the

¹ The Report of the Committee on the Re-Statement of the Nature and Aims of Liberal Education to the Commission on Liberal Education of the Association of American Colleges. Published in the *American Association of University Professors Bulletin*, June, 1943.

wealthier colleges which devote thought and money to these devices their usefulness seems to be generally admitted.

In substance, the committee's major proposals say: Let us go back to the prewar methods of our richer colleges and apply them generally to the postwar situation. Will they fit?

II

The first proposal (entrance tests) is obviously pertinent; the remaining three (individual instruction, expert counseling, and comprehensive examinations) seem too expensive for the postwar purse.

No one doubts that there will be a rush to college after the war. The usual neat transcripts from high school principals will often be absent or modified by other circumstances. Some soldiers will have forgotten their school knowledge, some may have unrecorded military schooling, and some will have peculiar knowledge of foreign languages and geography. No sets of their records, civilian or military, will be adequate; examinations will be necessary, and they also will be inadequate.

The confidence of the committee in the value of examinations is somewhat surprising, for an examination is primarily a convenient device for making a quick decision on an unknown person. No wise administrator uses formal examinations in selecting instructors; devisers of psychological tests themselves throw up their hands in horror at such an idea. "Convincing evidence was found [in the Pennsylvania Study] of the unreliability of single examinations or single weeks of examinations, even when supplemented by interviews."¹

The Pennsylvania Study examinations were conducted in quiet classrooms in a settled atmosphere. If they were unreliable to some extent, how reliable will be examinations for persons years out of school, fresh out of barracks discipline, burdened with bitter

¹ Mowat G. Fraser, *The College of the Future*, 1937. Dr. Fraser wrote with reference to the Study of Relations of Secondary and Higher Education in Pennsylvania which was initiated in 1929 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in cooperation with the Joint Commission of the Association of Pennsylvania College Presidents and the State Department of Public Instruction.

memories, in an alien civilian world? Entrance examinations appear to be necessary to handle the mob at our gates. We need to start at once devising the best possible ones, but we should be prepared to view their results with skepticism.

As for the other three proposals, Henry Adams had the answer, "The whole problem of education is one of its costs in money." "Such plans as the Harvard tutorial plan and the Princeton preceptorial plan," says D. H. Gardner in *Student Personnel Service*, "are not feasible in many institutions because of their cost." According to the 1943 Educational Directory the ratio of students to teachers in all American colleges is about 1 to 12; in seven small and well-known colleges that use the tutorial system the ratio is 1 to 7, which means an almost doubled teaching cost.

Expert counseling is also an expensive proposal, requiring psychiatrists and personnel experts as well as continuous interest, observation, and sympathy. To this ideal all colleges pay lip service. In the end, however, the burden usually rests on an overworked dean (or reasonable facsimile thereof) or on a large number of indifferent professors who reduce this unpaid, overtime chore to signing a schedule each semester. Meribeth E. Cameron in "Every Student Has a Faculty Adviser"¹ has described unsatisfactory counseling in colleges that cannot afford the *luxury* of "a corps of professional counselors, armed with tests and charts, neat formulae about human capacities and human behavior, and a wondrous trade vocabulary."

The fourth committee proposal is achievement and comprehensive examinations at graduation. Here, too, is a large gap between the catalogue and the performance; Edward S. Jones, charting 1191 students in 28 colleges, found that 42% had only routine class work (with or without course examinations) as preparation for the comprehensive final examination. In *Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges* he devotes 54 pages to desirable preparations for such tests: individual conferences, seminars, senior coordinating courses, and supplementary devices such as reading lists, clubs, review groups, senior theses. Needless to say, they require added time, teachers, and money.

¹ December, 1943 *Bulletin*.

III

Inasmuch as three of the committee's four proposals seem expensive, we should consider the financial prospects of colleges in a postwar world—a task the committee ignored.

There will be high and searching taxes after the war. The continuing impacts of graduated income taxes and of inheritance taxes are reducing the princely gifts that could have set up full-grown colleges overnight in the nineteenth century. Colleges will have to rely rather on smaller gifts from donors who prefer to give to charity rather than to pay similar sums in taxes.

The good old days of safe 5 and 6% investments of funds seem to be past. A probable inflation would reduce real income on bonded investments still further. State colleges and universities will have to compete with public building projects, doles, and bonuses, for state aid. (Legislators prefer to see their appropriations in shiny new buildings rather than in such "intangibles" as increased salaries and individualized instruction.) The federal government may be counted on to pay veterans' fees, but colleges after their experience with governmental cooperation in wartime will hesitate to ask for more aid—and more control.

Add to this probable inadequacy of income the problem of greatly increased enrollment. In 1916 college students (excluding those in teachers colleges, summer sessions, and extension work) numbered 354,325; in 1920 the enrollment was 30% higher. The 1942 enrollment was 1,316,158; a similar postwar 30% increase would mean 400,000 more students. There are three good reasons why the rise may be even greater following this war: the more-than-doubled number in military service, the lower draft age of 18 as compared with the draft age of 21 (the younger men will be more inclined to continue their education), and the larger governmental plans for education of veterans.

College buildings will be crowded. Most colleges were well occupied when the war started in 1941; enrollments had risen steadily during the depression except in 1933. But in these last three years of war there has been depreciation of buildings, without replacements. Even if troops are released slowly, they will be on some campuses long before red tape can be unwound from

authorizations of buildings and before priorities on building material can be secured.

An excess of students is also equivalent to a shortage of teachers; after all, you can't make professors out of soybeans. H. G. Badger and B. W. Frazier reported a drop of 6.7% in staff members of all institutions of higher learning between October, 1941 and October, 1942.¹ The student enrollment fell 13% in that time, but, since the two drops were in different subjects, 1060 colleges reported 1660 unfilled positions (medicine, engineering, economics, science, etc.) and 843 surplus teachers (English, commerce, history, etc.).

Even with the large declines in student enrollment, the shortage of teachers was so great in 1942 that 515 colleges (out of 801 colleges reporting) increased their hours of teaching, 405 discontinued courses, 201 retained teachers beyond retirement age, 80 reduced academic qualifications for positions, and 67 recalled retired teachers. Our devices to combat teacher shortage are already in use; we shall have to look for additional ones.

The committee's report recognizes the coming shortage, if not the recent one, and suggests the early release of teachers from military service. This may help a little, but teachers will have to fight their way out of uniform in competition with farmers needed for their crops, business men needed in the task of war-to-peace conversion, and fathers needed at the fireside. Furthermore, the military forces will make a desperate effort to hold their teachers both as experts in dealing with conquered peoples and as teachers of time-killing, morale-preserving courses for our soldiers.

Replacements from graduate schools will be small since these schools lost two-thirds of their enrollment in 1939-43. Even if funds were more plentiful, there would still be a teacher shortage. In view of all this, the committee's proposals for individualized instruction, counselors, tutors, and comprehensive examinations appear to be the blueprints of an expensive, impossible dream.

IV

What can we do? We shall need more teachers, more buildings, and an improved curriculum designed for adults.

¹ *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars*, October, 1943.

(1) To get more teachers quickly, colleges will have to break down the barrier between high school and college teaching positions. College administrators now rarely seek superior high school teachers; they usually go only to other colleges and to teachers agencies to fill their vacancies, and the field of inquiry covered is so narrow that the best teachers are not discovered at all.

If colleges will publicize their search for superior public school teachers, they will stimulate the abilities and ambitions of these persons, and an infusion of high school competence into college life will greatly improve the standard of teaching in the lower ranks and eventually in the higher ranks.

(2) A remedy for the shortage in college buildings—and in teachers also—is the systematic extension of junior colleges by the use of public school teachers and other qualified persons for part-time instruction in public school buildings.

Junior colleges have been growing rapidly in a haphazard way. There were about 200 in the United States in 1922, about 325 in 1927, and about 460 in 1943. Geographically they are unevenly scattered. Nine states (California, Texas, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Mississippi) had 243, or 53%, in 1943. Twenty-five states, about half the nation, had five or fewer junior colleges each. There were none in Delaware, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. New Mexico had one; Arizona, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, and Vermont, two each; Alabama, North Dakota, Ohio, and West Virginia, three each.

It is impossible to study this geographical picture intelligently unless one considers also population figures and the locations of four-year colleges and teachers colleges. But it seems probable that junior colleges are needed in many regions where populations are either sparse or mushrooming, where interest in education is stunted, and where democracy is relatively ignorant.

The four-year colleges in every region should cooperate in dividing their areas equitably and in setting up and supervising junior colleges. There are already a number of such arrangements in operation—parent universities, junior colleges in scattered cities with part-time teachers in public school buildings. All that is

needed is an extension of such organizations, more cooperation, more development of neglected sections.

What will happen to such systems when the rush of veterans is over? On January 26, 1944 Senator Thomas introduced Senate Bill 1670, "to establish a publicly supported adult educational program stemming from the State universities and land-grant colleges . . . supplemental to the cooperative agricultural extension service, making available to community groups and individuals the educational resources and research findings of these public institutions of higher learning." This bill, or some similar bill, is likely to pass in due time, for labor is now asking for the same educational aid that farmers have been getting. Well distributed junior colleges would aid greatly in any such system of general adult education.

(3) The committee's report refers several times to probable criticism by veterans of the "static devices and patently outmoded procedures" of college life. It realizes also that these students will need guidance and a comprehensive outlook on life. Hence they suggest tutors and counselors, and they offer a list of six skills and seven areas of knowledge, leaving it to the tutors to chart or "cover" the areas.

The seven areas "which a person must explore to be liberally educated" together form a fanciful "Pays de Sagesse" that should delight all educators because no imaginable pasture has been omitted. The first area alone offers work for a lifetime: "the world of nature—the data, methods, and achievements of the physical and biological sciences, the historical development of these sciences, their technological value, and the philosophy of science." (There is no mention whether this should count nine or eleven credits toward graduation.)

The other areas are equally spacious—(2) the history and principles of social, political, and economic institutions, (3) American civilization and its European background, (4) other cultures, primitive, oriental, etc., (5) the arts and crafts in their historical setting, (6) man himself, and (7) "man's attempt through the ages to understand what life means and how to be a responsible and useful human being." These seven areas overlap so frequently that no practical curriculum could be based on them, and they de-

mand a lifetime of study instead of four years. Here is another idealistic blueprint to put on the shelf beside the expensive technical proposals.

To control and interest adult veterans in a microcosm arranged for adolescents is a task that requires both courage and philosophy. They will need more than a comprehensive examination in order to achieve comprehension. Of every college subject they are entitled to know where it starts, where it ends, what it is useful for, and what its relations with other subjects are. What can this new lost generation begin with, as axioms of biology, laws of history, standards of art? What is the direction of evolution and the goal of culture? What are the connections between science and ethics, between culture and history, and how do all these areas fit into a philosophy of life, a pattern of the universe?

Most educators, teaching elementary facts to adolescents, have for years evaded such adult questions and have merited the contempt of movie makers and Congressmen. The natural scientists have until recent years usually stuck to what A. G. Keller calls "the dense core of verified facts," and have shunned the *meta*-physical world. Biologists have let the harassed public school-teachers fight the battles of Dayton alone. "Historians," writes W. K. Ferguson, "have been loath to discuss either the principles guiding their work or its general usefulness to society." Robert F. Griggs of the National Research Council protests, "Over and over again as I endeavor to facilitate the contributions of biology and agriculture toward winning the war, I encounter the unorganized and incoherent condition of our group of sciences." Christian Gauss reports, "Humanists and historians have become afraid to pronounce moral and aesthetic judgments." "Perhaps," observes J. B. S. Haldane, "the careful attempts to isolate university staffs from the impact of history have disqualified them from valid judgments on the highly concrete problems of right and wrong."

Such protests as these, which I have assembled from different fields, and the more explosive urgencies of war itself have resulted in some action. As London was cleaning up its debris in September, 1941, the British Association held a Conference on Science and World Order and framed "A New Charter of Scientific Fellowship." The next month while the German armies were at the gates

of Leningrad and only a hundred miles from Moscow, Russian scientists assembled in the latter city to exchange information and to establish contacts with Allied scientists. Week after week in the pages of *Nature* (London, 1941) British scientists debated Dr. C. H. Waddington's thesis on "The Relations between Science and Ethics."

There have been similar stirrings in America, most surprising of which was the action of the Board of Directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers. In October, 1943 they established a fund of \$50,000 to get collective bargaining for their members, caught in the pincers of labor laws and closed shop classifications. "Other [engineering] societies," predicts Dean H. P. Hammond, "are scheduled soon to consider the same problem." In the words of President R. E. Doherty of the Society for the Promotion of Engineering Education, "Certainly the issues of this war have made it increasingly clear that engineers must understand the social and economic world they live in." Elsewhere Chauncey D. Leake finds it "remarkable that three leading American biologists [E. G. Conklin, C. J. Herrick, S. J. Holmes] representing the east, the mid-continent, and the west, should have come to about the same conclusion at the same time regarding the biological basis for ethics." In another area we find the Modern Language Association of America issuing two pamphlets in 1940 and 1942 as "a formulation of the values and objectives of linguistic and literary studies." And finally, Arthur H. Compton, retiring last January as President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said, "Scientific men are becoming increasingly conscious of their social responsibilities. . . . Whether we call it religion or humanism or social expediency, acceptable objectives must and will be found."

In the disillusioned postwar decade of the 1920's, the people of England and America turned hungrily to a book and made it a best seller. It was issued first in England in monthly parts at a shilling apiece and then in book form. The American publishers hoped that they would sell a thousand copies but they sold more than a million. It was serialized in newspapers, and imitated by dozens of other authors.

It was H. G. Wells' *Outline of History*, the first book to present to the common man in language that he could understand, the

history of the whole world as a slow, sure, continual progress. To the usual textbook history he added the slow painful beginnings recorded in geology; to the bloody tale of Europe he attached the records of India and China, South America and Africa. While the professional historian sneered at the large number of factual errors, the common people found a new faith and hope; the progress of life on earth.

Our new postwar college generation, bred in the long years of depression and matured in war, will need a faith. They will not get it from tutors and examinations, nor from scientists contentedly isolated in laboratories nor from apostles of culture bound in the amoral chains of history. Unless we are to leave them again to the services of some new brilliant novelist, we must act promptly and unitedly. Our great organizations of scientists and scholars must examine their axioms and their aims, must correlate them with neighboring creeds, must clarify them for impatient students, and must defend them courageously in the market place.

TEN YEARS' EXPERIENCE WITH COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS

By HAROLD H. TITUS

Denison University

After ten years' experience with comprehensive examinations which were required of all seniors in their major subjects, the faculty of Denison University asked President Kenneth I. Brown to appoint a committee to study the total program of comprehensive examinations on the local campus; to inquire concerning the practices of other colleges; and, finally, to report to the faculty the committee's recommendations. This article, which is the report of the study, is presented in the hope that it may be of help to other faculties in studying their programs. It has been written in response to requests that the committee share its findings with other schools.

When the committee started to work in the autumn of 1943, it assigned the following responsibilities to members of the committee: to write the local history; to assemble a bibliography and collect examinations which are in print; to gather information from other colleges and universities; to send a questionnaire to heads of departments and to staff members; and to study the comprehensive examinations given at Denison over a ten-year period.¹ As the study was getting under way, the President invited Dr. Edward S. Jones, author of *Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges* (1933), to spend a day on the campus. His discussions with members of the committee and with a larger group of faculty members were especially valuable.

¹ The members of the committee who assumed these responsibilities are in order: Professors Harold H. Titus (Philosophy), Chairman; Lindley R. Dean (Classics); Leland J. Gordon (Economics); Helen A. Barr (Physical Education); Danner L. Mahood (English); and Joseph H. Rush (Physics and Astronomy).

II

The history of the comprehensive examinations at one institution may have less value for the general reader than other phases of the study. For this reason we shall give only a few facts which will serve as a background for the local study. In the year 1931, after much discussion of educational procedure in general and of the improvement of teaching in particular, the Denison faculty voted to require comprehensive examinations for seniors in their major subjects. The examinations were planned as three-hour written examinations, the period of any one examination not to exceed four hours. Seniors were to be excused from classes during the week of the examinations and from final examinations in courses in their major fields during that semester. Heads of departments were expected to ask staff members to assist in the examining, and two copies of the examination questions were to be filed in the Library. The comprehensive examinations were to be optional in 1933 and required in 1934. Any minor modifications or details were to be left in the jurisdiction of the Executive Council.

Before the comprehensive examinations began, steps were taken to acquaint both faculty members and students with the system and its operation. One special faculty meeting was set aside for such a discussion and, later, the students affected were required to attend conferences conducted by the heads of departments for their respective majors.

In 1941 the Denison University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors discussed comprehensive examinations and sent a questionnaire to the heads of departments at Denison. While disclosing variations of procedure, the answers clearly indicated that comprehensive examinations were in favor among faculty members. The chairman of only one department was doubtful regarding the value of such examinations. In 1943, due to war conditions, including an accelerated and concentrated program, the comprehensive examination was waived as a graduation requirement for the men in the military units.

While the system of comprehensive examinations was held in favor by most faculty members, a number of faculty members

were critical of certain features of the examinations and of the lack of uniformity in standards and practices. Furthermore, some students were critical of the examinations as given by some departments.

III

The committee sent a questionnaire to fifty-five colleges and universities in the United States. The list was made up by selecting a group of schools known to be making some use of such examinations ten years ago, and by adding to that list additional colleges or schools of the same general type as Denison, a co-educational liberal arts college of about one thousand students. We received forty-six replies. When we eliminated the schools not using comprehensives, three men's schools which have temporarily discontinued them due to loss of civilian students, and the schools using such examinations for honors students only, we were left with twenty-eight replies from schools giving the examinations to all or practically all of the members of their graduating classes. Comprehensive examinations have been used from six to thirty years, respectively, in the twenty-eight colleges contacted.

In reply to the question, "Have your results been satisfactory?" the answers from the twenty-eight schools were unanimously affirmative. There were some mild qualifications or statements such as "with minor exceptions" or "in the main." Three replies were elaborated as follows: "We believe that the impetus given by the examination to the student to review and correlate the work in her major subject has distinct educational value" (Wellesley College); "Members of the faculty are very enthusiastic about the results of these examinations" (Wells College); "Our experience with major examinations was carefully reviewed two years ago by our faculty, and at that time the faculty voted unanimously to continue the system" (Whitman College).

Apparently the typical examination includes two written examinations of approximately three hours each, and approximately one hour of oral examining. Without exception the com-

prehensive examination is given toward the end of the second semester of the senior year. Twenty-three of the schools use the oral examination as well as the written. Visiting or outside examiners are used regularly by only two of the colleges and universities which were contacted; sometimes by ten of them; and not at all by sixteen. One liberal arts college spends \$1500 to \$2000 annually for its visiting examiners; another institution pays travelling expenses plus \$25 for each examiner; still another uses an exchange system. Interdepartmental visitation is practiced in thirteen colleges in place of visiting examiners.

The number of days allotted to the comprehensive examinations ranges from one to twelve. Students are freed from attendance and requirements in regular courses during the comprehensive examination period in all except two of the schools. Reading or study periods are provided in sixteen of the twenty-eight schools and students are ordinarily freed from attendance and requirements in their regular courses during this study period. Eighteen of the institutions do not require course examinations in the major field at the end of the semester or term in which the student takes his comprehensive examination; in seven schools course examinations are required; and in three they are required sometimes, depending upon the caliber of the student's work.

Only two of the forty-six schools which returned the questionnaire have tried and then abandoned comprehensive examinations. Both were large state universities. In one case the dean reported that the examination had come to be largely a final over-all review in the courses elected by the student in his major field. The teachers in certain departments active in its abolition argued that their courses were arranged in such a sequence as to make a comprehensive examination unnecessary. In the other case the dean reported that the comprehensive examinations were considered satisfactory by many departments but that two or three departments which had the largest number of majors to examine objected to it and succeeded in getting a majority vote in favor of abolition. On the other hand four institutions not giving comprehensive examinations are considering their introduction and, instead of supplying us with information, requested that we share our findings with them.

IV

Wishing to have before it as complete a picture as possible of the comprehensive examination system on the local campus, the committee sent one questionnaire to chairmen of departments, and another to staff members in those departments. It also studied the examinations given during the preceding ten-year period, and held an open committee meeting, to which students were invited to come and to express their views. Since this phase of the study will probably be of minor interest to the general reader we shall present little more than some brief generalizations of our findings.

A correlation was noted between a lack of enthusiasm or direct criticism of the system and failure to give what might really be called comprehensive examinations. In those departments giving comprehensive examinations regarding which the committee could find little to criticize, there was a tendency for chairmen of departments, staff members, and students to support the system and to feel that it had value. Where the teachers had not caught the meaning and purpose of the examination, there was a tendency for teachers to be critical and for students in those departments to resent the examinations. Considerable variation in methods, in point of view, and in thoroughness had grown up over the years. This was due in part to the fact that, since the adoption of comprehensive examinations, there had been various changes in the personnel in some departments, along with little or no over-all supervision. Furthermore, the accelerated and concentrated schedule, adopted because of war conditions and the presence of military units on the campus, led to new problems and irritations.

Some departments were maintaining high standards and were giving comprehensive examinations which the committee members felt were satisfactory. These departments were found in all the main branches or areas of study; in the natural sciences, the social studies, the languages, and the arts. On the other hand, some departments were giving comprehensive examinations on groups of particular courses, in which the questions were specific and factual and called for little critical thought. A few departments were making too large a use of "objective" or "short-

answer" questions, or projects or papers, which the committee thought were inadequate as comprehensive examinations.

Sixteen of the twenty departmental chairmen from whom we received replies felt that "some uniformity among departments is desirable." All of these agreed that minimum standards should be set, and eleven favored maximum demands. Half of these heads of departments favored some "over-all supervision of the comprehensive examination system." The criticisms made by chairmen of departments include a lack of uniformity and supervision of examination content and procedure. Nearly all of them believe that the comprehensive examination system is of value to the student, to the department itself, and to the university.

A majority of the staff members who replied to our questionnaire expressed satisfaction with the system. Their chief criticism was to the effect that the examinations in some departments were not sufficiently comprehensive. A few of these teachers did not have much to do with the examinations. A majority, however, had had opportunity to submit questions, to read and to help grade the papers, to participate in the orals, and to help in the preparation of students. For most of them it had been a "gratifying experience."

In response to an invitation from the committee, a group of students, majoring in nine departments, attended an open meeting of the committee during which the subject of comprehensive examinations was freely and frankly discussed. The students agreed that the system was good, but they offered certain criticisms which fall under three main headings: (1) *The lack of uniform standards* as a result of which students in some departments do much more work than in others, although their degrees are the same. (2) *The time factor* which requires absence from classes just before course examinations. (3) *The detailed, factual type of questions* asked in certain departments. Some mentioned the strain incident to the attempt to memorize details from three or four years of work. If given comprehensive questions which are thought-provoking and challenging, the students support the system. They resent and fear the type of examination whose main purpose is to find out what they have memorized.

V

In March, 1944, after a study covering the greater part of one academic year, the committee unanimously recommended "That comprehensive examinations be continued and strengthened, and that they be given *time*, *dignity*, and *publicity*." The first part of the report was an abstract of the findings of the committee similar to the facts given in the first part of this article. The second part of the report contained the committee's recommendations. The more important specific recommendations follow in quotations, along with some additional comments by the writer.

A. The Administration of Comprehensive Examinations

1. "That all members of the staff in each department should participate in preparing, administering, reading, and grading the examinations, and in conducting the orals where orals are required."

2. "That the faculty reaffirm its requirement that two copies of all written comprehensive examinations be filed in the library. Also that the titles of projects, problems, or theses be filed." While there is occasionally some criticism of this requirement on the part of teachers, questions are likely to be better and to be more carefully worked out when this rule obtains and the questions are available to all students. There is less temptation for a teacher to use the same questions again, and the questions can be consulted by a supervisory committee.

3. "That a committee from the teaching members of the faculty be created to coordinate the comprehensive examination system and to report to the faculty at least once a year. We suggest a standing committee of three to five to be appointed by the President upon the adoption of these recommendations." Part of the criticism of comprehensive examinations had been due to the lack of uniform standards and supervision, and sixteen chairmen of departments had expressed themselves as believing that some uniformity was desirable.

4. "That a system of visiting or exchange examiners be developed. We suggest that individual departments be encouraged to experiment at once on a voluntary basis."

5. "That oral examinations be open to any interested visitors."

B. The Content of Comprehensive Examinations

1. "That every department give an examination which is really comprehensive in scope." The purpose of the examination

is to find out not merely what the student has memorized but chiefly what he can do with the facts he has learned. The examination should test his ability to use information in new situations. It should test relational thinking and power of thought. Factual questions on specific courses, questions of recall, or a thesis alone, are inadequate.

2. "That the duration of the comprehensive examination be from a minimum of six and one-half hours to a maximum of fifteen hours, with the following suggested content: (a) At least one three-hour written examination, not more than twenty-five per cent of which shall be composed of 'objective-type' questions. (b) A second three-hour written examination; or a recital, or a project, or a thesis as an alternative for such examination. (c) An oral examination." If standards and practices vary too widely there is likely to be irritation and criticism. Dr. Edward S. Jones reports that of twenty-two colleges with the longest examining experience only one is giving examinations of the short answer type primarily.¹

3. "That a system of point values be given to the five varieties of expression listed above (written examination, oral examination, recital, project, and thesis), in order to define the relative emphasis to be placed upon each, the details to be worked out and reported by the coordinating committee." These point values need not be the same for all departments, except that undue weight should not be placed on one item such as a thesis or a project. This provision would encourage variety as well as a degree of unity among departments.

4. "That some part of the examination should relate the major field or the field of concentration to the general division of knowledge (the related departments) and to contemporary problems of living."

C. The Preparation for Comprehensive Examinations

1. "That special guidance be given to the student in the choice of his field of concentration and in the preparation for comprehensive examinations." The committee feels that the student's academic advisers have an important responsibility for the success of the comprehensive examination system. The recommendation was made in this form because another committee had recommended changes looking toward the strengthening of our system of academic advisers.

2. "That the second semester calendar be so arranged as to include a one-week reading period for graduating seniors imme-

¹ "Philosophy of Examining," the *Journal of Dental Education*, February, 1941.

diately preceding the comprehensive examination, the details to be worked out later. A three-day period for comprehensive examinations is recommended." The committee recognized that it would be difficult to carry this recommendation out under the present accelerated schedule.

3. "That no credit be given for tutorial sessions or any other specific preparations on the part of the student. This recommendation is based on the objection to giving credit to students for doing work which they are already expected to do without credit. This is not intended to discourage non-credit tutorial sessions." Furthermore, it is not meant to discourage senior seminars or tutorial courses for credit, but they ought not to be conducted for the purpose of preparing a student for a comprehensive examination, and the comprehensive examination ought not to be merely the final examination at the end of such a course.

The comprehensive examination can be a genuine teaching device and be so conducted that it serves to enhance the work of the college as an educational institution. It can be of value to the teacher, to the department, and to the student for whom it is primarily designed. The large majority of schools that have given comprehensive examinations a trial find the results satisfactory.

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION FOR WAR AND PEACE

By D. A. WORCESTER

University of Nebraska

The problems confronting those engaged in preparing persons for the professions vary immensely. Colleges of law, for example, have for the moment almost ceased to exist. Their biggest task is to hold together something of their staff and to lay plans by which their work can be resumed after the conflict is over. Circumstances are very different for some of the other professional groups. Take, for example, the field of education. Just a few years ago we had more teachers than we knew what to do with, and the number of children entering schools was decreasing. So we set out on a definite plan to discourage from entering the profession those who we thought would not make really fine teachers. In the Teachers College of the University of Nebraska we had committees to determine certain restrictions for those entering the sophomore year and to devise special curricula for "master teachers." Now many teachers have been drafted, many others have been urged to go into the military forces as special teachers of mathematics, science, and the like, and there has seemed to be a very special mutual attraction between school teachers and the various women's services in the war. However, there has been no appreciable lessening of the demand for teachers and the increasing birth rate suggests that the demand will hold up for some time. As a result, instead of selecting candidates for the profession of teaching more carefully than formerly, we are aggressively searching for students to come to us. Also, in order to staff the schools to even minimum necessities, we have to provide short courses for recent high school graduates and refresher courses for those who once possessed a certain competency but who have not for several years been watered from the professional sprinkler. (And

some of these are badly wilted.) We have not lost all of our good teachers nor all of our students, but this problem of emergency training is one of our most serious concerns.

The theological seminaries are also, I am told, having unusual difficulties. Again, the demand is up and the supply is down. The armed forces are short of chaplains, and the seminaries are short of candidates. The young men who are physically fit have to be unusually secure in their faith to ask military deferment in order to enter theological training. These youth, too, were reared during a period when the ministry as a whole was not being fitted for a society at war, and many who wish to become ministers are not sufficiently war-minded to enter sympathetically into the duties imposed by the current tragedy.

Graduate schools of social work are also in a serious situation. All of the indications point to an immense demand immediately after the close of the war for persons trained to help individuals make social adjustment. There will be more persons needing such aid than we have ever had before and yet almost nobody is presenting himself for training in this field.

In such professions as engineering or medicine the situation is very different. The demand for trained personnel is not only enormous but the government furnishes the supply. These schools are in the position of the ruler whose subjects tie a bear to a tree so that he can be sure to get his game when he goes hunting. We select men of the very highest abilities, pass them over to the colleges, and say: "Get us a lot of engineers and doctors and get them quickly. Don't waste any more than you have to but in war waste is inevitable. Get us trained men." Instructors in these schools are deferable and priorities on equipment may be obtained—even may be taken away from other professional schools. Obviously the task of professional training in these colleges is similar in many ways to that, for example, of theology, while education has the same necessity for haste but must make its bricks with an insufficient amount of straw.

II

In order to get results in those cases where the need is so pressing several plans are being tried. Some schools are giving just the

same program of studies but are "pouring it on" at accelerated rates; adopting trimester or other all-year-around schemes, and perhaps operating six days a week. Summer schools crowd regular semester courses into five weeks. The student's daily load is increased, sometimes *requiring* as many as 26 contact hours per week between student and his instructor—an amount which would not have been *allowed* a few years ago by most universities even to their best students. Frequently high school pupils are being urged to enter college even before they have entirely completed the regular secondary curriculum in order to get them more speedily into the professional program.

Almost always the objectives of training are immediate and practical. What research there is is of the applied variety. On this point, Professor George Baitzell of Yale University has said, "War is responsible for advances in scientific knowledge because it takes new discoveries that have not been fully developed and mobilizes scientific thought and energy in advancing them so that the war effort may profit," but, "the emergency conditions necessitated by armed conflict are not conducive to fundamental discoveries." It has recently been pointed out, too, that with all of the immense production of airplanes for war purposes, almost no attention has yet been given to new designs for the planes for peace and one of the great automobile manufacturers states that the only people who are designing a new automobile are the artists.

It may be that more research is being accomplished during this war than during previous ones and, of course, we must not minimize the practical advances being made. I have heard the statement, for example, though I do not know how it could be verified, that due to the perfecting of techniques for the treatment of wounds and infections, the first world war within 20 years saved more lives than it cost. But certainly, when it comes to matters of professional training of any kind, we have not yet had much research; and we need it very badly indeed. There is the possibility of saving the professional lives of innumerable young people in the generation to come through things we may learn as a result of our war training programs. Our present knowledge of the relative values or dangers of these programs is the most meagre. Let's not

add to the horrors of war by refusing to profit by our war experience.

Some questions which need to be answered are:

(1) Do students learn effectively in accelerated programs? (2) How well do they retain what they have learned? (3) Will the health of students be impaired by accelerated programs or by heavier loads? (4) Are accelerated plans suited for some students but not for others? But through these programs will youth be too immature to enter peacetime professional activities?

Already we have much argument concerning these questions—some of it passionate. But we have almost no facts. Some alleged facts are not. I have heard it said in the name of psychology, for example, that short intensive courses violate the psychology of learning as it relates to massed and distributed practice; that it has been shown that it takes about so much time for knowledge to “sink in.” This is to misquote psychology. I have looked long and in vain for reports of research which are really pertinent to this question. There are none. Our experiments have dealt with material, almost always learned verbatim, in which intervals of rest of as little as five minutes constitute distributed learning. There are *no* studies of the relative values for learning or retention of class work done daily, or three, or two times a week; of 50, or 90, or 100 minute periods; or, of courses presented in 5 weeks, or 9 weeks, or 12 weeks, or 18 weeks. Persons speak of the schools and colleges operating under “forced draft” but as a matter of fact we have no idea what “forced draft” is. We need such studies and, with all of the schemes being tried over the country, now is the time to get some. Right now we are collecting a few such data at the University of Nebraska. I hope it may be done in many more places and our results pooled.

It should be noted, however, that the findings from such studies may not give the final answers to our questions. The methods of teaching should be adapted to the length of each class period and to the number of weeks in the term. Accelerated courses may not be effective because the instructor has been unable or unwilling to reorganize his own procedures. I know one instructor whose students complained that he spent so much of his time scolding about

the shortness of the term in which he was required to teach that he gave them little material in the time which he did have. So our researches should include not only the factor of time but also that of method.

I have seen no reports on the health of persons going to school for differing lengths of terms. However, in some countries even the elementary schools are in session 11 months of the year, and an increasing number of college students in this country have been electing to go to summer schools as well as to the regular academic sessions. Whether or not accelerated programs are injurious to student health is a subject that has not yet been investigated.

Nor do we know how heavy loads students can carry effectively. I am sure that the conventional standard of 16 or 18 hours is not based on any research. We are especially in the dark about the amounts which can be carried safely by persons of varying abilities. It has been demonstrated, however, that some students can and do carry successfully heavier loads than they have usually been allowed to carry. Engineering students have for years carried more credit hours per semester than have arts college students. It will be hard to convince the engineers that theirs are "snap" courses and hard to convince the arts colleges that their students are mentally inferior. Yet the arts colleges still are likely to limit their students to a registration less than that of the engineers. Hosts of students, too, carry full school loads and work for pay from two to ten hours a day on the side. And the studies which have been made on the subject have indicated that those who work for pay tend to get higher marks than those who have no outside employment. It will probably be agreed to by most that students should have opportunities for social as well as intellectual development but the balance between these has, in the past, been more accidental than planned.

What about the matter of general maturity? A year or so ago I was told that the representative of a large industry employing engineers said that we must not graduate students too young because they were not ready to enter the professional world until they had acquired maturity just from living about so long. Again, the statement is all right, but what is *too young*? Do we know at what age a person is ready to be an engineer, or a doctor, or a

teacher, or a minister? Are the ages the same for all professions? Do bright persons mature earlier or later than dull ones? Is the rate of this social maturation influenced by the experiences of the professional school? Well, there is not very much evidence on these inquiries but what there is suggests that the engineer quoted above need not be very fearful. Most employers like to get Phi Beta Kappas or members of other honorary organizations on their staffs and these tend to be *younger* rather than *older* than their classmates. In a study at Ohio State University, Pressey found that those who were much younger than the average made higher marks, engaged in as many or more "activities" and, in the one field which he investigated, education, were reported after their first year in the profession as being fully as successful as the average of the class. This does not prove that all, or even most, would be successful at this earlier age but it does suggest that age is not of itself the significant factor. Incidentally, I should be willing to wager—a small amount—that most of us who read this completed our college work at ages younger than the averages of our classes.

Perhaps, too, we shall not have to worry so much in terms of the present average student. Several investigations have revealed that never yet have we drawn into our professional schools even *half* of the *honor* students of the high school classes. It is to be hoped that the system used by our armed forces for the selection of the best professional material will be refined and expanded after the war. A much more careful determination of the individual's interests as well as his intellectual capacity and more consideration of his temperamental fitness for certain kinds of work than is now given will be essential, but this will require only extensions of procedures now known but not fully developed. If this be done and provision be made for education of all capable students without regard to the income of their parents, we shall be able to secure for our training persons of ability.

III

Now I should like to approach the matter of future professional education from a somewhat different point of view. Sometime ago I was talking with a colleague who teaches electrical engineer-

ing. He remarked that a large portion of what he was teaching was not even known when he was in college. This conversation led me to ask many others of my colleagues about the differences in the content of their courses from what these had been a few years ago. For the most part the story was the same. Much new material must now be included—one man said that to list all of the new material would be a good deal like giving the table of contents of his text. In my own field of psychology there were in 1910 nine national journals. In 1940 there were 26 such journals. The number of technical terms in the subject has, I should judge, at least tripled in that time, the new ones including those dealing with mental and aptitude testing, psychoanalysis, and much of statistics. In psychology, as in most of the other subjects reported to me, this new material is nearly all *in addition* to that which was taught when we were undergraduates; there are not, in other words, subtractions from knowledge to compensate for the additions.

The load required then for one to become competent in his field is greater than it used to be. What about our educational practices and procedures? Have they changed in keeping with the changes in the content of our courses? I fear not. Our beginning course in psychology is for the same number of hours per week and the same number of weeks per semester as in 1910. We require the same number of semester hours for graduation from the university. The standard student load, in number of hours, is the same. The official statement of the time required for a graduate degree is the same. There have been changes in a few special fields but they have not been many or large. This may account, in part, for the attitude of some university teachers who declare that present-day student bodies are inferior to those of their time. Passing by the possible defense mechanism displayed by such remarks and overlooking the likelihood that these men are making comparisons with their present knowledge rather than with what they knew when they were in college, it is evident that they ignore the fact that the present student's load is greater than was theirs and the *probable* fact that *instruction is little better*.

In many of our professional fields the war will result in still greater masses of knowledge to be mastered by those about to enter them. Any group which would prepare adequately for the postwar

world must start making blueprints, and, in my opinion, should start right away. We are told that when the war is over we shall have to get along for a while with 1942 model cars. Shall we have to get along with 1942, or for that matter 1914, model lawyers, educators, and doctors? I have talked recently with a well-known lawyer who thinks that law will never be the same again. The growth of administrative law (some of my suspicious Republican friends think it is lawless administration), the lessening of emphasis on rules of evidence will require a quite different type of legal education. Will the law schools now running on skeleton staffs or shut down entirely improve their opportunities to reorganize their curricula? *Each* professional school should make effort to have some one of the staff planning for the future, no matter what the pressure of wartime necessity.

It might be implied from what has been said that professional education will necessarily require more years of a student's time than formerly; but there are other possibilities. Let us analyze the issues a little further, repeating perhaps, for convenience, a little of what has already been said. If, as a result of any advance in any of our professions, *any new content at all* is added and if we assume that the work is to be done only equally as well as it was previously then it follows that either:

the course must indeed be lengthened, or
we must drop out something already in it, or
the students must work harder, or
we must secure better students, or
we must streamline the course.

Probably we shall find it wise to do more than one of these things. Probably there is a good deal in almost any of our curricula which can and should be eliminated. Nothing should be retained for its traditional value only. I anticipate, however, some heated arguments among those who will try to decide what is to be dropped. I, for one, would drop Latin from those courses preparatory to law, medicine, and pharmacy. Some wouldn't. What will the writers for the *New York Times* be willing to drop of United States history to make way for a discussion of the events of the last 30 years? Whatever we eliminate will not do much to settle our problem be-

cause, as has been mentioned, the additions surely exceed that to be subtracted.

As we have said, it is not likely that it will hurt students to have longer terms and I anticipate that the trimester or some other near-all-year-around plan will be generally adopted before many years. This will make it possible to extend the curriculum a good deal and still get the youth into the professions as early as they do now. Students, I am sure, will be glad to work harder than they have done if we will only set up for them a plan of work which is suited to them and for which they can see some reason.

IV

But beyond these things, whatever we do in respect to the possibilities just mentioned, it seems imperative that we should streamline our educational procedures. Streamlining is a term which has been misused badly these days. It has commonly been employed as a synonym of acceleration. But we do not streamline a car by driving it faster. Neither is it streamlining to leave off certain gadgets or to put on others. Nor do we streamline an airplane by loading it more heavily. Streamlining is a matter of design. To streamline a body is so to design it that it offers the least resistance to the air or fluid in which it moves or which moves against it. Further, streamlining is of no particular significance except at high speeds. At 35 miles per hour an unstreamlined auto uses no more fuel than a streamlined one. At 80 or 90 miles per hour the difference in design may be important. Now in making our blueprints for postwar professional education we must plan on high speeds.

We must see what we can do, then, not only in choosing good students and re-examining what we will teach them, but we must also redesign our curricula. We have ample evidence that some students can carry, if properly motivated, 20 or 24 hours of work and do it well. We shall have to streamline some of our antiquated rules as to what students may do. We must find what the proper load is for each student, in terms of his abilities, his aptitudes, and his interests and adjust his program accordingly. If we do this, perhaps a larger percentage than the present 33% of those entering certain professional schools will finish the course.

We need to redesign some of our own attitudes, too. Instructors have been known to speak with pride of the numbers of failures in their classes. *Indeed, teachers are the only ones I know who brag about their failures.* If we select students with special aptitudes for our work and if we adapt our methods of instruction to their needs, we shall no longer distribute our marks according to a curve of chance.

Especially shall we need to redesign the content of our courses and the methods of our instructions to meet the needs of those who are returning to our colleges after a year or two years or more of service in the armed forces or in important industries. These persons are going to have, much more clearly than any of them ever had before, definite educational goals, and they will have learned what type of material will really contribute to the achievement of these ends. They will have had, in many instances, practical experience in fields which they now wish to know from the theoretical standpoint. They will not be content and should not be content with the formal courses which have so frequently been presented to the ordinary student.

We shall need to rewrite our texts. Here is a place where the experience of the war effort may be of inestimable value to us. For example, in the war we have learned how to prepare manuals in foreign languages which will make it possible for soldiers to get along in other countries, and I suspect some of them master the verb "to love" in much less time than that allowed in the ordinary college course.

We are learning to prepare all sorts of materials so that they can be grasped quickly and with the minimum of help from instructors. In the field of psychology, a committee has prepared a little book called *Psychology for the Fighting Man*. It is not such a little book either, even though it is pocket size. It contains nearly 450 pages and covers more of the subject than does the ordinary text in the first course. And here is a rather amazing statement concerning it made by one of the leading psychologists of the country, "It was necessary to decide whether the book should be a handbook, a textbook for study, or a volume to be read and enjoyed by the soldier whose schedule called for no training in psychology. The decision was made to prepare a volume suitable for non-classroom

reading. This involved writing in a popular science style which no academic psychologist has mastered. So Miss Marjorie Van de Water, one schooled in preparing reports for the *Science News Letter* and other popular reading was called in to help write the manual." Later the reviewer states that experience "has already indicated that *Psychology for the Fighting Man* can be advantageously used as a supplementary college text;" and the chairman of the committee which prepared the book has announced that a test on the same principle is being prepared.

While not agreeing that no academic psychologist can write a book which could be read and enjoyed (I am sure some educational psychologists have done so), I must admit that few of them *have* ever so written. It has rarely been suggested that a text could be enjoyed; indeed, the term *text* is almost a guarantee to a student that it will be uninteresting. One way to lower the resistance of our students may be to design materials for study in terms of their language and their abilities.

Instructional methods should be reorganized, too. We have heard much of the immensely increased production of our industrial plants as a result of new techniques in engineering. It is really amazing that so many persons, some even who have had a share in engineering development, have assumed that there is no possibility of increasing intellectual production through educational engineering. There is not time even to sketch the many attempts in recent years to find ways of teaching classes which will take into consideration the individual differences of students and motivate them to direct their own learning and to progress at their own rates. There have been many such experiments and some of these plans have met with outstanding success. We need more of such educational engineering and we need to inform ourselves of that which has been done by others. I fear that these examples of streamlining are too rare in terms of all of our teaching but it is here that we have the greatest possibilities of fitting our professional education to the coming peacetime world.

To accomplish the research which will be necessary to get the answers to such questions as those I have raised will, of course, require some expenditure; but perhaps we who are engaged in pro-

fessional services can help convince our legislatures, state and national, that funds so expended will be worth while.

In the story *Rifleman Dodd* an account is given of a soldier in the Napoleonic wars who, separated from his company, showed unusual ability not only to take care of himself, but to organize guerilla warfare to harrass the enemy. "England," says Forester, the author, "had spent a great deal of money and the deepest thought of her keenest minds on making a good soldier of him; she could have made a useful citizen of him for half the expense and trouble if there had been no war—except that in that case she would have judged it better policy to save her money."

EFFECTS OF THE WAR UPON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, 1943-44

By HENRY G. BADGER and BENJAMIN W. FRAZIER¹

United States Office of Education

This is the second annual report made by the U. S. Office of Education on the effect of the war upon colleges.² The data were secured from questionnaire returns made on, or soon after, October 15, 1943. The questionnaire was mailed to the 1746 institutions of higher education listed in the Educational Directory, 1942-43, Part III, Colleges and Universities, of the U. S. Office of Education; but inasmuch as 44 of these institutions were closed, merged with other institutions, or dropped from the Directory during the year, 1702 institutions actually received the inquiry.

Usable replies to the questionnaire were received from 888, or 52.2 per cent, of the 1702 institutions. These replies came from every section of the country and from all major types of institutions for higher education.

Staff

In 1939-40, the various institutions of higher education in the country employed a total of 131,652 teachers. In the fall of 1943 the total number of college teachers was estimated at 118,125, which represented a decrease of 10.3 per cent from the 1939-40 figure.

The sex composition of the 1943 faculty differed somewhat from that of the 1939 faculty. The 94,536 men who constituted 71.9 per cent of the group in 1939-40 dropped to an estimated 80,005, or 67.7 per cent of the 1943 total. The number of women increased

¹ Assisted by Margaret J. S. Carr, Maude Farr, and Katherine G. Welsh, statistical clerks in the U. S. Office of Education.

² The first report, "Effects of the War Upon College Personnel," by the writers was issued by the U. S. Office of Education in June, 1943 (Circular no. 217); also published in *Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars* Vol. 19, pp. 5-17, October, 1943.

TABLE I—CHANGES IN FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF, OCTOBER 15, 1942 TO OCTOBER 15, 1943

Type of Institution	Number of Institutions Reporting	Per Cent of Decrease (or Increase +)									
		Total Staff			Full-Time Staff			Part-Time Staff			
		Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	
All institutions Universities, colleges, and professional schools Teachers colleges Normal schools Junior colleges	866	5.5	7.0	2.0	3.9	5.3	0.8	10.5	11.9	6.8	
	537	4.8	6.2	1.0	2.4	4.0	+1.8	11.6	12.0	10.3	
	127	7.2	8.8	5.8	7.1	9.0	5.4	8.5	5.4	11.1	
	16	1.9	0.0	3.1	1.6	+2.9	4.9	2.7	12.0	+2.1	
	186	10.2	17.4	1.3	14.0	20.0	7.1	2.3	12.5	+12.5	
Publicly controlled institutions Universities, colleges, and professional schools Teachers colleges Normal schools Junior colleges	319	6.7	8.2	3.3	4.9	6.7	1.1	14.1	14.5	13.0	
	95	5.8	7.2	1.3	2.2	4.7	+5.8	18.1	16.3	23.0	
	118	6.9	8.3	5.5	6.6	8.3	5.0	11.8	8.9	14.3	
	9	2.2	+5.5	7.3	2.6	+9.5	10.8	0.0	20.0	+11.8	
	97	13.8	19.4	5.0	24.2	26.4	20.7	+10.1	2.5	+28.0	
Privately controlled institutions Universities, colleges, and professional schools Teachers colleges Normal schools Junior colleges	547	4.2	5.8	0.6	2.6	3.7	0.4	8.2	10.3	1.4	
	442	4.0	5.3	0.8	2.5	3.3	0.8	7.7	9.6	1.0	
	9	17.4	22.9	13.0	28.8	38.8	20.9	+9.1	+13.8	+5.4	
	7	1.4	7.0	+2.4	0.0	7.1	+5.9	4.3	6.7	3.2	
	89	5.8	14.3	+2.3	0.4	7.6	+4.9	15.8	23.2	4.7	

from 37,018, or 28.1 per cent of the 1939-40 total, to an estimated 38,120, or 32.3 per cent of the 1943 total. Since the data for 1943 are for October 15 of that year, the totals may change somewhat before the 1943-44 school year is over.

From October 15, 1941 to October 15, 1942 the number of teachers dropped 6.7 per cent; and in the year ended October 15, 1943 it dropped 5.5 per cent from the 1942 figure. That is, while the number of college teachers in October, 1943 was 10.3 per cent less than the 1939-40 count, it was 11.2 per cent less than the number in the fall of 1941, just before the entry of the United States into the war.

Between October, 1942 and October, 1943 there were decreases in staff of 7.0 per cent among men and 2.0 per cent among women (Table 1). The decrease was 3.9 per cent among all full-time teachers and 10.5 per cent among all part-time teachers. Publicly controlled institutions lost 6.7 per cent of their teaching staffs, institutions under private control 4.2 per cent, junior colleges 10.2 per cent, teachers colleges (degree-granting) 7.2 per cent, colleges of arts and sciences 4.8 per cent, and normal schools 1.9 per cent.

The probable continuance of Selective Service until the close of the war, the discontinuance of most Army Specialized Training Program units, and the continued demands of war industries and agriculture for manpower, will probably remain indirect causes for losses of college staff members until the close of hostilities. Direct causes for the loss of staff members, such as their entrance into the armed forces, war and related industries, and government, no longer operate with quite the force felt earlier in the war period.

New Staff Members.—There was a greater turnover among college teachers during the year ended October 15, 1943 than in the preceding year (Table 2). In October, 1942 the number of college teachers new to their positions was estimated at 11,000 full-time teachers (12.2 per cent of the total of full-time staff members) and 5500 part-time teachers (18.0 per cent of the total of part-time staff members). In October, 1943 the number of new teachers was estimated at 13,320 full-time teachers (14.6 per cent of the total) and 5430 part-time teachers (20.0 per cent of the total).

Unfilled Positions.—Reports from 684 institutions provide the basis for estimates that for the nation at large over 12,500 members

of college teaching staffs left their positions between the May-June commencement of 1943 and October 15 of the same year (Table 3).

TABLE 2—INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF MEMBERS IN 1943-44 WHO WERE NOT AT THE SAME INSTITUTION IN 1942-43

Item	Staff Members		
	Total	Men	Women
Total staff members October 15, 1943 ^a	118,125	80,005	38,120
Full-time	91,005	60,495	30,510
Part-time	27,120	19,510	7,610
New staff members, October 15, 1943 ^b	18,753	11,390	7,363
Full-time	13,322	8,288	5,034
Part-time	5,431	3,102	2,329
Per cent new staff members	15.9	14.2	19.3
Full-time	14.6	13.7	16.5
Part-time	20.0	15.9	30.6

^a Estimates based on returns from 866 institutions.

^b Estimates based on returns from 776 institutions.

TABLE 3—NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF POSITIONS VACATED IN 1943 AND POSITIONS STILL UNFILLED AS OF OCTOBER 15, 1943^a

Department or Field	Number of Staff Leaving		Number of Positions Unfilled, October 15, 1943	
	Men	Women	Old	New
Agriculture	480	13	179	13
Biology	401	232	74	15
Chemistry	669	128	79	51
Physics	590	71	133	209
Mathematics	442	145	110	120
Engineering	510	13	143	89
Economics	521	77	92	20
Physical education for men	556	79	125	71
Home economics	20	559	15	26
Dentistry	56	5	...	5
Medicine	528	92	204	10
Pharmacy	38	...	3	...
Nursing	5	176	13	8
Other	3423	2703	676	148
Total	8239	4293	1846	785
Per cent of staff members leaving, still unreplaced October 15, 1943	22.4	18.3

^a Estimates based on returns from 684 institutions.

Two-thirds of those leaving were men and one-third were women. At least 13 fields of instruction were affected. Those in which the estimated number of positions vacated was more than 500 were as follows: chemistry, 797; physics, 661; physical education for men, 635; biology, 633; medicine, 620; economics, 598; mathematics, 587; home economics, 579; and engineering, 523. In a number of these fields a large proportion of the positions remained unfilled as late as October 15. Among these were physics, with 51.7 per cent of the vacancies still unfilled; engineering with 44.4 per cent; mathematics with 39.2 per cent; agriculture with 38.9 per cent; medicine with 34.5 per cent; and physical education for men with 30.9 per cent. In sharp contrast with these fields, home economics, although it lost a large number of teachers, had only 41 vacancies still unfilled as of October 15. This was only 7.1 per cent of the 579 positions vacated during the summer. Of all positions vacated during the summer, 21.0 per cent were still unfilled on October 15.

Student Enrollments

From about the turn of the century, college enrollments increased steadily, although not evenly, until 1933-34 when the first decrease was reported. They recovered quickly from this decrease caused by economic depression, however, and continued their upward trend until they reached 1,493,203 in 1939-40.¹ Of this number, 1,364,815 were in residence the third week of the fall term of 1939 (Table 4). This latter group included 4322 military and 1,360,493 nonmilitary students.

By the fall of 1943 the total enrollment of students at universities and colleges had dropped to an estimated 1,120,300, which was 17.9 per cent less than the enrollment for the fall of 1939. Of these 1,120,300 students, only 761,630 were nonmilitary. This group is smaller by 598,863, or 44.0 per cent, than the nonmilitary enrollment reported at the outbreak of hostilities in Europe in 1939. Of the total lost, 556,737 were men and 42,126 were women.

¹ This is the latest official figure. A tentative estimate of the 1940-41 enrollment is 1,538,800, of whom 1,406,409 were in residence the third week of the fall term of 1940.

College enrollments before 1939-40 usually increased by at least 75,000 to 100,000 every two years. Hence this loss of nearly 600,000 civilian students from the 1939-40 total is less than the true loss. The extent of the decrease can be appreciated more fully when it is recalled that the enrollment of all institutions of higher education in 1923-24 was 823,063. As a result of the decline in nonmilitary college enrollments, the loss to the nation in terms of technical advancement, cultural education, and civic competency has become a problem of the first magnitude.

When this loss in nonmilitary students is analyzed by type of institution, it appears that during the past four years the institutions which confer the baccalaureate in arts and sciences and professional degrees have lost 41.6 per cent of their nonmilitary students; teachers colleges, 53.0 per cent; normal schools, 60.8 per cent; all teacher-training institutions as a group, 53.7 per cent; and junior colleges, 52.1 per cent. Institutions under public

TABLE 4—TOTAL NONMILITARY ENROLLMENT THIRD WEEK OF FALL TERM 1939 AND OCTOBER 15, 1943

Institutions by Type and Sex of Students	Nonmilitary Enrollment		
	Fall of 1939 ^a	October 15, 1943 ^b	Per Cent of Decrease
I. All Institutions			
All institutions	1,360,493 ^c	761,630	44.0
Men	812,177 ^c	255,440	68.5
Women	548,316	506,190	7.7
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	1,067,494 ^c	623,710	41.6
Men	678,012 ^c	231,670	65.8
Women	389,482	392,040	+0.7 ^d
Teachers colleges	143,645	67,470	53.0
Men	57,463	7,770	86.5
Women	86,182	59,700	30.7
Normal schools	13,235	5,190	60.8
Men	3,373	270	92.0
Women	9,862	4,920	50.1
Junior colleges	136,119	65,260	52.1
Men	73,329	15,730	78.5
Women	62,790	49,530	21.1

Institutions by Type and Sex of Students	Nonmilitary Enrollment		
	Fall of 1939 ^a	October 15, 1943 ^b	Per Cent of Decrease

II. Publicly Controlled Institutions

All institutions	722,243 ^c	351,510	51.3
Men	425,532 ^c	106,510	75.0
Women	296,711	245,000	17.4
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	476,801 ^c	246,490	48.3
Men	310,112 ^c	87,270	71.9
Women	166,689	159,220	4.5
Teachers colleges	137,691	63,440	53.9
Men	55,541	7,650	86.2
Women	82,150	55,790	32.1
Normal schools	11,129	3,480	68.7
Men	3,082	160	94.8
Women	8,047	3,320	58.7
Junior colleges	96,622	38,100	60.6
Men	56,797	11,430	79.9
Women	39,825	26,670	34.0

III. Privately Controlled Institutions

All institutions	638,250	410,120	35.7
Men	386,645	148,930	61.5
Women	251,605	261,190	+3.8 ^d
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	590,693	377,220	36.1
Men	367,900	144,400	60.8
Women	222,793	232,820	+4.5 ^d
Teachers colleges	5,954	4,030	32.3
Men	1,922	120	93.7
Women	4,032	3,910	3.0
Normal schools	2,106	1,710	18.8
Men	291	110	62.2
Women	1,815	1,600	11.8
Junior colleges	39,497	27,160	31.2
Men	16,532	4,300	74.0
Women	22,965	22,860	0.5

^a Total of 1708 institutions reporting.^b Estimates based on returns from 843 institutions.^c Does not include 4322 students in United States service schools.^d Increase.

control have lost 51.3 per cent, whereas those under private control have lost only 35.7 per cent.

The estimated total enrollment of 1,120,300 in the fall of 1943 just referred to represents a decrease of 7.3 per cent from the 1,209,150 reported for the fall of 1942. Unpublished data assembled in the Office of Education indicate that the loss in non-military enrollments for all institutions of higher education from October, 1942 to October, 1943 was 34.4 per cent. The decrease may be compared with those found in other studies in this field. Eells¹ reports a median decrease of 32 per cent in the enrollment of 239 junior colleges. Walters,² reporting on nonmilitary enrollments in 671 degree-granting institutions, set the average decrease at 30.5 per cent; and Wickey³ found the average decrease among 571 church-related colleges and universities to be 28.3 per cent.

The 761,630 nonmilitary students in residence on October 15, 1943 included 255,440 men and 506,190 women (Table 5). The ratio of women to men is thus approximately 2 to 1, a sharp contrast to the 1939-40 enrollment in which the ratio was 2 women to 3 men.

The group includes 32,062 graduate students, an unprecedented decline from the 100,000 usually enrolled in graduate schools just before the war. Graduate students now number 4.2 per cent of the total student body, instead of approximately 7 per cent as they did in 1939-40. The seriousness of this loss in terms of the postwar recruitment of college teachers can scarcely be over-emphasized. This loss, which will come at a time when the return to the classrooms of hundreds of thousands of veterans, war workers, and others whose college education was deferred, will demand a sharp increase in the number of specially qualified college staff members.

The heavy lack of newly prepared college staff members will be met in part by the return of former teachers from the military forces, from war and related industries, and from government.

¹ Eells, Walter C., "Enrollment Data," *Junior College Journal*, Vol. 14, 139, November, 1943.

² Walters, Raymond, "Statistics of Attendance in American Universities and Colleges, 1943," *School and Society*, Vol. 58, 484, December 25, 1943.

³ Wickey, Gould, "A National Study of Enrollments at Church-Related Colleges and Universities," *College and Church*, Vol. 9, 2 (No. 3); Mimeo.

The number of former faculty members who return to the colleges will depend somewhat upon economic conditions.

TABLE 5—ESTIMATED NONMILITARY ENROLLMENT, OCTOBER 15, 1943

Item	Total	Men	Women
Enrollment:			
Total	761,630	255,440	506,190
Graduate	32,062	16,325	15,737
Second year or above	8,099	4,922	3,177
First year	23,963	11,403	12,560
Undergraduate	729,568	239,115	490,453
Senior year	100,846	26,131	74,715
Junior year	109,841	26,189	83,652
Below junior year	518,881	186,795	332,086
Percentage distribution:			
Total	100.0	33.5	66.5
Graduate	4.2	2.1	2.1
Second year or above	1.1	0.7	0.4
First year	3.1	1.4	1.7
Undergraduate	95.8	31.4	64.4
Senior year	13.2	3.4	9.8
Junior year	14.4	3.4	11.0
Below junior year	68.2	24.6	43.6

Among the 761,630 nonmilitary students are 68,645 men and 174,104 women (a total of 242,749) in the junior, senior, and graduate groups. These include 14,687 students in engineering, 11,359 in biology, 13,127 in chemistry, 22,723 in home economics, and 14,064 in commerce and business. The other 166,784 are in fields enrolling fewer than 10,000 students each.

For certain of the fields comparative data are available on enrollments for both 1942 and 1943 (Table 6). In engineering the 1943 total is only 42 per cent of the 1942 total. In biology the 1943 enrollment constitutes 85 per cent of the total for 1942. Corresponding percentages are: Sociology, 84; chemistry, 75; mathematics, 66; and physics, 59. On the other hand, home economics shows an enrollment of nearly 112 per cent of its 1942 total.

The 1943 total of men in the subjects reported for both years is less than 40 per cent of the 1942 total in these same subjects. The decrease indicates the effect of Selective Service and other war man-

power requirements. Enrollment of women, however, shows an increase of 14 per cent. A loss of 35.4 per cent is shown in undergraduate enrollments in contrast to a 27.0 per cent loss in graduate enrollments.

Wartime losses tend to cumulate at successive school- and college-year levels. Thus, the losses of high-school students during the past four years (8.7 per cent) have contributed, and will continue to contribute for several years, to the loss of undergraduate college students (44.0 per cent). Further, these combined losses partially account for student losses in graduate schools, which were 69.0 per cent during the four-year period, and which will continue for a long time to come. Inasmuch as enrollments on all three of these levels of instruction had been steadily increasing before the war, the real losses of students are even greater than these percentages indicate.

The chief causes for the decrease in students—Selective Service and employment in war-related industries and other occupations—will undoubtedly continue to operate actively until the close of hostilities. There is a marked tendency at present to reduce the number of students granted Selective Service deferment; to lower physical requirements for induction into military services; and to eliminate college training for servicemen in the ground forces and air forces. While there are signs of a leveling-off in employment in certain war industries and in government, the demand for both men and women workers in most fields continues unabated. Further losses in college enrollments are to be expected.

A large number of students lost to the high schools and colleges during the war will be lost permanently. On the other hand, many will return, the number depending largely upon the length of the war, postwar economic conditions, and the extent to which Federal educational aid is granted to veterans. In many institutions where men students predominate, veterans and former war workers may constitute a major part of the enrollments for several years after hostilities cease.

Students First Time in College.—It is not possible to classify by years all nonmilitary students registered in college on October 15. The statistics (Table 7) suggest that there is an abnormally large proportion of students not classifiable as graduates or upper

TABLE 6—ESTIMATED NONMILITARY ENROLLMENTS, OCTOBER 15, 1943^a AND ENROLLMENTS OCTOBER 15, 1942^b
IN CERTAIN MAJOR SUBJECT FIELDS

Item	Grand Totals			Undergraduate Majors				Graduate Majors			
	Total	Men	Women	Junior Year		Senior Year		First Year		Second Year or Higher	
				Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total, all fields reported 1943	242,749	68,645	174,104	26,189	83,652	26,131	74,715	11,403	12,560	4,922	3,177
I. Total, fields reported both years:											
1942	126,684	81,995	44,689	40,310	21,190	33,372	19,523	4,975	2,769	3,338	1,207
1943	82,883	31,843	51,040	12,491	25,323	13,119	22,982	3,995	2,111	2,238	624
Per cent 1943 is of 1942	65.4	38.8	114.2	31.0	119.5	39.3	117.7	80.3	76.2	67.0	51.7
A. Engineering:											
1942—Total	35,082	34,924	158	18,279	120	14,826	24	1,270	12	549	2
Aeronautical	2,086	2,084	2	1,162	1	833	..	75	1	14	..
Chemical	7,170	7,128	42	3,661	34	2,894	3	363	4	210	1
Civil	4,695	4,667	28	2,413	21	2,041	7	154	..	59	..
Electrical	6,350	6,321	29	3,284	24	2,623	1	312	4	102	..
Mechanical	10,897	10,849	48	5,780	37	4,735	10	229	..	105	1
Other (unclassified)	3,884	3,875	9	1,979	3	1,700	3	137	3	59	..
1943—Total	14,687	14,554	133	6,224	66	7,125	28	991	15	214	24
Aeronautical	937	927	10	495	6	397	4	35
Chemical	3,263	3,232	31	1,379	20	1,521	7	240	4	92	..
Civil	1,547	1,537	10	766	2	701	6	57	..	13	2
Electrical	2,629	2,612	17	1,034	9	1,410	4	153	4	15	..
Mechanical	3,742	3,724	18	1,614	11	1,903	7	148	..	59	..
Other (unclassified)	2,569	2,522	47	936	18	1,193	..	358	7	35	22
Percent 1943 is of 1942											
Total	41.9	41.7	84.2	34.1	55.0	48.1	..	78.0	..	39.0	..
Aeronautical	44.9	44.5	..	42.6	..	47.7	..	46.7
Chemical	45.5	45.3	..	37.7	..	52.6	..	66.1	..	43.8	..
Civil	32.9	32.9	..	31.7	..	34.3	..	37.0	..	22.0	..
Electrical	41.4	41.3	..	31.5	..	53.8	..	49.0	..	14.7	..
Mechanical	34.3	34.3	..	27.9	..	64.6	..	56.2	..	59.3	..
Other	66.1	65.1	..	47.3	..	70.2	..	261.3

B. Other fields:											
1942—Total											
Biology	91,602	47,071	44,531	22,031	21,070	18,546	19,499	3,705	2,757	2,789	1,205
Chemistry	13,347	7,840	5,507	3,805	2,570	3,099	2,170	624	587	312	180
Economics	17,506	13,968	3,538	5,987	1,760	4,885	1,329	1,687	340	1,409	109
Home economics	18,775	14,382	4,393	7,156	2,141	6,468	1,923	394	169	364	160
Mathematics	20,357	69	20,288	25	9,573	33	9,529	3	950	8	236
Physics	7,120	4,211	2,909	2,065	1,412	1,681	1,242	286	173	179	82
Sociology	4,029	3,577	452	1,592	218	1,176	163	491	38	318	33
	10,468	3,024	7,444	1,401	3,396	1,204	3,143	220	500	199	405
1943—Total											
Biology	68,196	17,289	50,907	6,267	25,257	5,994	22,954	3,004	2,096	2,024	600
Chemistry	11,359	3,948	7,411	1,794	3,731	1,438	3,063	496	486	220	131
Economics	13,127	7,812	5,315	2,551	2,871	2,585	2,116	1,448	215	1,228	113
Home economics	5,130	1,518	3,612	586	1,871	594	1,597	246	113	92	31
Mathematics	22,728	6	22,722	3	10,853	..	11,068	..	632	3	169
Physics	4,661	1,022	3,639	345	1,896	363	1,538	194	133	120	72
Sociology	2,390	1,915	475	609	220	635	171	374	56	297	28
	8,801	1,068	7,733	379	3,815	379	3,401	246	461	64	56
Per cent 1943 is of 1942											
Total	74.4	36.7	114.3	28.4	119.9	32.3	117.7	81.1	76.0	72.6	49.8
Biology	85.1	50.4	134.6	47.1	112.3	46.4	141.2	79.5	82.8	70.5	13.8
Chemistry	75.0	55.9	150.2	42.6	163.1	52.9	159.2	85.8	63.2	87.2	203.7
Economics	27.3	10.6	82.2	8.2	87.4	9.2	83.0	62.4	66.9	25.3	19.4
Home economics	111.6	8.7	112.0	12.0	113.4	..	116.2	..	66.5	37.5	71.6
Mathematics	65.5	24.3	125.1	16.7	134.3	21.6	123.8	67.8	76.9	67.0	87.8
Physics	59.3	53.5	105.1	38.3	100.9	54.0	104.9	76.2	147.4	93.4	94.8
Sociology	84.1	35.3	103.9	27.1	112.3	31.5	108.2	111.8	92.2	32.2	13.8
II. Fields reported in 1943 only:											
Total	159,866	36,802	123,064	13,698	58,329	13,012	51,733	7,408	10,449	2,684	2,553
Agriculture	3,293	2,935	38	901	102	1,116	115	427	77	491	64
Commerce and business	14,064	3,245	10,819	1,287	5,742	1,525	4,737	356	284	77	56
Forestry	134	131	3	49	3	64	..	18
Nursing	5,320	15	5,305	5	3,132	10	2,019	..	141	..	13
Public administration	373	112	261	28	128	33	100	46	28	5	5
Social work	3,566	230	3,336	23	481	31	427	156	2,170	20	258
Other	133,116	30,134	102,982	11,405	48,741	10,233	44,335	6,405	7,749	2,091	2,157

* Estimates based on returns from 561 institutions.

* Estimates based on data from 766 institutions.

level or senior college students. These students are not, however, all freshmen and sophomores; many are undoubtedly special or unclassified students.

It is possible to estimate the number of nonmilitary students who were in college for the first time on October 15. Apparently 60,645 men and 154,940 women (a total of 215,585 persons) can be so classified. An interesting feature of the distribution of these students is that for each sex the numbers enrolled in privately controlled universities, colleges, and professional schools alone are almost the same as the total numbers enrolled in all publicly controlled institutions of higher education. This is the first time since 1933-34 that privately controlled institutions have enrolled 50 per cent of the total student body.

TABLE 7—ESTIMATED NUMBER OF NONMILITARY STUDENTS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR FIRST TIME, OCTOBER 15, 1943^a

Institutions	Total	Men	Women
All institutions	215,585	60,645	154,940
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	152,735	46,060	106,675
Teachers colleges	19,540	3,100	16,440
Normal schools	1,470	250	1,220
Junior colleges	41,840	11,235	30,605
Publicly controlled institutions	97,365	28,545	68,820
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	55,845	17,980	37,865
Teachers colleges	19,060	3,035	16,025
Normal schools	570	55	515
Junior colleges	21,890	7,475	14,415
Privately controlled institutions	118,220	32,100	86,120
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	96,890	28,080	68,810
Teachers colleges	480	65	415
Normal schools	900	195	705
Junior colleges	19,950	3,760	16,190

^a Estimates based on returns from 749 institutions.

Age of Students.—An estimate of enrollments in colleges by age indicates that, despite the workings of Selective Service and the demands of industry, there is still a wide spread in the age of students, extending from under 17 to past 37 years (Table 8). The median age of men first time in college is 17.8 years, or 17 years and

10 months. Corresponding medians for other groups are: Women first time in college, 18.3 years; all college men, 19.5 years; and all college women, 19.4 years. For the fall of 1940 the median age of men students first time in college was 18.9 years; and of all college men, 19.2 years. Corresponding data for women students are not available.

The most probable explanation of the fact that the median age of men has dropped so sharply, and that it is, for beginning students, below the median for women, lies in the workings of Selective Service.

TABLE 8—AGES OF NONMILITARY RESIDENT COLLEGE STUDENTS, OCTOBER 15, 1943

Age in Years	Students First Time in Any College ^a		Total Students ^b	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Total	60,645	154,940	255,440	506,190
Over 37	574	630	5,063	8,772
35-37	232	219	2,817	3,112
30-34	595	618	7,409	6,526
25-29	1,137	1,721	17,803	13,405
24	403	579	7,257	4,541
23	520	843	10,618	8,215
22	899	1,567	15,126	16,386
21	1,254	3,208	20,619	44,381
20	2,162	6,483	25,211	77,276
19	3,873	16,660	29,892	110,693
18	13,856	61,989	42,490	130,434
17	28,759	50,938	59,685	69,941
Under 17	6,381	9,485	11,450	12,508
Median	17.8	18.3	19.5	19.4
Quartile 3	18.8	18.9	22.2	20.7
Quartile 1	17.3	17.6	17.9	18.3

^a Estimates based on returns from 508 institutions.

^b Estimates based on returns from 479 institutions.

Summer-Session Enrollments.—Reports from 602 institutions show that the summer sessions of 1943 were not so well attended as were those of 1942 (Table 9). A decrease of 15.9 per cent in enrollment occurred. The decrease among men students was 34.8 per cent; among women, only 1.8 per cent. Publicly controlled institutions suffered a somewhat heavier decrease than was experienced by those under private control.

Data from 484 institutions reporting on summer-session students

first time in college showed the opposite trends with an increase of 11.6 per cent for all students, 3.6 per cent for men, and 20.2 per cent for women.

A comparison of 1941 and 1943 summer-session data indicates decreases of 29 per cent in enrollment of men students, 3 per cent in enrollment of women students, and 13 per cent in total enrollment for the four-year period.

Predictions of future summer enrollments are highly uncertain, even for the early years of the postwar period. During the first World War, enrollments of college-grade students decreased some 13 per cent between the summers of 1915 and 1917, but increased 70 per cent between 1917 and 1919, and continued thereafter to increase at a phenomenal rate. Although conditions are considerably different during the present war, several basic factors are similar; and it appears probable that a rapid increase in summer enrollments can be expected within a reasonable period after hostilities cease.

Data on summer-session enrollments are at present rather illusory because of the changes taking place in college calendars. In many institutions the summer session is really part of an all-year program, with more or less expectation that students will remain in attendance throughout the year. In other institutions the summer session is not held every year. In still other cases two or more institutions have merged for the summer session, with consequent difficulties in accounting for students. In view of these conditions, the data here given should be regarded only as generally indicative of the changes occurring.

TABLE 9—PER CENT OF DECREASE IN SUMMER-SESSION ENROLLMENTS, JULY 15, 1942 TO JULY 15, 1943

Item	Number of Institutions Reporting	Per Cent of Decrease		
		Total	Men	Women
I. All students:				
Total	602	15.9	34.8	1.8
Publicly controlled institutions	265	17.9	35.5	3.1
Privately controlled institutions	337	13.3	33.3	+0.9 ^a
II. Students first time in any college	484	+11.6 ^a	+3.6 ^a	+20.2 ^a

^a Increase.

Degrees Conferred

During the 12-month period, July, 1942 to June, 1943, an estimated 207,021 degrees in course were granted by the universities, colleges, and professional schools of the nation (Table 10). This represents a decrease of only 9500 from the 1939-40 total of 216,521.

This decrease is almost entirely within the master's degree group, in which only 17,827 degrees were conferred in 1942-43 as contrasted with a total of 26,731 in 1939-40. The decrease of only 760

TABLE 10—ESTIMATED NUMBER OF DEGREES GRANTED, JULY, 1942 TO JUNE, 1943
WITH COMPARATIVE DATA FOR 1939-40^a

Field	Number of Degrees					
	Bachelor's or First Professional		Master's or Second Professional		Doctor's	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1942-43:						
Agriculture	6,281	144	518	36	373	11
Biology	3,216	2,561	318	183	233	36
Chemistry	5,136	1,472	526	78	463	25
Commerce and business	10,089	4,251	272	49	28	..
Physics	921	121	93	23	98	4
Mathematics	1,071	1,277	68	74	42	9
Engineering:						
Aeronautical	1,071	4	40
Chemical	3,676	6	233	..	104	..
Civil	2,367	11	121	..	6	..
Electrical	3,227	6	147	..	9	..
Mechanical	5,751	4	125	..	4	..
Other	3,753	13	240	23	21	..
Economics	3,377	1,398	146	38	83	6
Forestry	488	..	15	..	9	..
Public administra- tion	123	100	38	8	2	..
Sociology	963	3,473	136	183	42	13
Social work	44	426	93	452	6	4
Home economics	132	10,969	..	516	..	13
Nursing	2	1,650	..	32
Other	40,585	65,581	6,858	6,145	1,502	308
Totals, 1942-43	92,273	93,467	9,987	7,840	3,025	429
Totals, 1939-40	109,829	76,671	16,508	10,223	2,861	429

^a Estimates based on returns from 610 degree-conferring institutions.

in bachelor's degrees (186,500 in 1939-40 to 185,740 in 1942-43) appears negligible, but further analysis of the data shows a decrease of 17,556 men and an increase of 16,796 women, thus reflecting to a marked degree the wartime withdrawal of men from college.

The increase in doctorates conferred is entirely among men, the estimated number of women taking this degree in 1942-43 being exactly the same as the actual number for 1939-40.

Of the persons taking the baccalaureate, 19,891, or 10.7 per cent, were in engineering courses. Commerce and business was the next most common major, an estimated 14,340, or 7.7 per cent of the total, being in this field. Home economics accounted for 11,101 or 6.0 per cent. Other fields in which more than 5000 students majored included: Agriculture, 6425; biology, 5777; and chemistry, 6608.

Although wartime losses have not been nearly so great in the number of degrees granted as in the number of students enrolled, it is to be expected that there will be heavy decreases in the total number of degrees granted in 1944 and thereafter. The number of seniors in 1943-44 is estimated at only 68.3 per cent of the number in 1942-43. Future graduate enrollments will be affected correspondingly.

Expenditures

An average increase of 1.7 per cent in expenditures of institutions of higher education from 1942-43 to 1943-44 is forecast in reports made by 672 institutions over the country.

Included in the summary are reports of 264 publicly controlled and 408 privately controlled institutions. The former group expects an average increase of 3.9 per cent, but the latter group is planning on an average decrease of nine-tenths of one per cent. The effect of military enrollments with their accompanying subventions is seen in the fact that the 259 institutions to which military students have been assigned report an average increase of 2.5 per cent in their expenditures, whereas the 413 which enrolled only civilian students report practically no average increase.

An average increase of 1.7 per cent is reported for the degree-granting universities, colleges, and professional schools. The junior college group, however, shows a decrease of 4.2 per cent.

Teachers colleges (degree-granting) report an increase of 2.6 per cent, but nine normal schools in the summary show an increase of more than 25 per cent. Engineering schools report an increase of 6.5 per cent, and schools of theology, 2.8 per cent.

Averages alone may be misleading, as there are wide variations in practically every group of institutions. For example, of three junior colleges in one state two plan to hold their 1943-44 budgets within 1 per cent of those for 1942-43, but the third expects a cut of more than 39 per cent. Other junior colleges range from expected decreases of 33 per cent to increases of 20 per cent or better.

Of two state colleges reporting expenditures of approximately \$500,000 each in 1942-43, one expects an increase of 48.2 per cent and one a decrease of 46.5 per cent. In one state one teachers college expects a decrease of 26.0 per cent, and another, a decrease of 74.2 per cent. A third in a state nearby expects its 1943-44 budget to amount to well over twice its budget for 1942-43.

The data were not classified by size of institution. It appears, however, that the smaller institutions expect greater fluctuations than the larger institutions.

To facilitate comparison, the expenditure figures have been reduced to index numbers. Using 1929-30 as the base year, the resultant indices biennially from 1929-30 to 1939-40 and annually since are as follows:

1929-30.....	100.0	1939-40.....	128.4
1931-32.....	109.8	1940-41.....	132.8
1933-34.....	93.8	1941-42.....	146.6
1935-36.....	104.8	1942-43.....	146.5
1937-38.....	124.0	1943-44.....	149.0

Using 1939-40 as the base year, the indices for that year and annually since are as follows:

1939-40.....	100.0	1942-43.....	114.1
1940-41.....	103.4	1943-44.....	116.0
1941-42.....	114.2		

These tentative index numbers suggest that the national total of educational and general expenditures for higher education in

1943-44 will probably be in excess of \$600,000,000. These figures do not take account, however, of the decreases in expenditures

TABLE 11—CHANGES IN EDUCATIONAL AND GENERAL EXPENDITURES, 1942-43 TO 1943-44

Item	Number of Institutions Reporting	Amount Reported		Per Cent of Increase (or Decrease)	Number of Institutions with No Budget for 1943-44
		1942-43 Actual	1943-44 Budget		
All institutions reporting	672	\$252,565,720	\$256,917,880	1.7	43
By control:					
Publicly controlled	264	136,444,909	141,829,054	3.9	9
Privately controlled	408	116,120,811	115,088,826	-0.9	34
By sex of students:					
Coeducational institutions	517	212,314,549	216,449,506	1.9	25
Institutions for men	61	12,508,863	12,526,163	0.1	8
Institutions for women	94	27,742,308	27,942,946	0.7	10
By basis of enrollment:					
With military enrollments	259	173,006,497	177,323,677	2.5	18
Without military enrollments	413	79,559,223	79,594,203	0.04	25
By level and curricular offering:					
Degree-granting:					
Universities, colleges, and professional schools	350	198,768,192	202,104,083	1.7	28
Teachers colleges	110	29,088,028	29,833,351	2.6	5
Engineering schools	9	7,374,385	7,850,076	6.5	2
Theology	31	2,513,975	2,585,091	2.8	2
Other professional ^a	30	3,427,315	3,374,543	-1.5	1
Nondegree-granting:					
Junior colleges	133	10,552,064	10,111,463	-4.2	5
Normal schools	9	841,761	1,059,273	25.8	..

^a Includes schools as follows: Commerce, 1; dentistry, 1; design, 1; law, 4; medicine, 2; music and/or art, 10; occupational therapy, 1; osteopathy, 2; pharmacy, 6; and social service, 2.

occasioned by the discontinuance of most of the Army Specialized Training Program units.

Institutions Without Budgets (Table 11).— In addition to the 672 institutions which made statements on their finances, no fewer than 43 replied that they had not yet set up their budgets—in other words, they were operating on a day-to-day basis. In a few instances this report was received at Washington as late as mid-November, although in most cases it was received during October. This, however, was at least three months after the fiscal year 1944 had begun in half or more of the institutions over the country.

Of the institutions operating without budgets, 9 are under public control and 34 are privately controlled. Eighteen have military enrollments and 25 have civilian students only. Some of those with military students said that their plans were dependent upon action by the military authorities. Eight institutions are for men, 10 are for women, and 25 are coeducational. Twenty-eight are institutions offering the baccalaureate in arts and sciences or in professional work, and 5 are junior colleges. Of the independent professional schools 2 are engineering schools, 2 are theological seminaries, and 6 are professional schools of other types.

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Association Dinner Meeting, Washington, D. C.

On Friday evening, April 14, a dinner meeting of the American Association of University Professors was held in the Sheraton Hotel in Washington, D. C., in connection with the meeting of the Council of the Association held on April 14-15. Present at the dinner were 125 members of the Association, including, in addition to the members of the Council, members of the Association from institutions in or near Washington and many members who are on leave of absence from their regular academic posts and temporarily in Washington while engaged in war service.

Dr. Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, was the toastmaster for the dinner. Professor Elmer Louis Kayser, Dean of University Students of the George Washington University, speaking as a member of the George Washington University chapter of the Association and also as a native Washingtonian, welcomed the guests to the city. The principal addresses of the evening were those of the retiring President of the Association, Professor W. T. Laprade of Duke University, and of the incoming President, Professor Quincy Wright of the University of Chicago. The addresses of Professors Laprade and Wright are published elsewhere in this issue of the *Bulletin*.

Iowa Conference of University Professors

The Conference met on November 6 at the Bishop Cafeteria in Des Moines, Iowa, with sixteen representatives present from the following institutions: Central College, Coe College, Cornell College, Drake University, University of Dubuque, Iowa State College, and Luther College. Brief reports with reference to the size of the membership and the plans of the chapters were presented by members from each institution.

Professor Warren N. Keck of Coe College addressed the group on the subject "The Influence of Wartime Educational Procedures

on Education after the War." He stated that an increase in student enrollments following the war is anticipated, largely due to several factors: many service men and women who have been in training programs in the colleges and universities will wish to continue their studies; the return of many men and women whose education had been interrupted; and the government subsidy for the education of veterans. The liberal arts colleges may expect these influences on the curriculum: continued emphasis on mathematics, physics, and other courses preparing for professional study; increased attention to languages, including Chinese and Japanese; improved courses in geography and meteorology; and renewed interest in the humanities.

An address on "The Returning Soldier in College" was presented by Professor Charles J. Ritchey of Drake University. He spoke of the extensive work which is now being done by the Armed Forces Institute, and stated that veterans will expect liberal support for further study. A uniform policy among colleges is being developed in order to give credit for courses studied during the war. The more mature student, returning from military life, will expect an increased measure of academic freedom and will need sympathetic and understanding teachers.

After discussion of these addresses Professor William M. Goldsmith of Central College spoke briefly on "The Importance of the American Association of University Professors in the Small College." He stated that membership in the Association expresses the teacher's wish for full citizenship in his profession, and it heightens the teacher's interest in higher education, particularly in fields other than his own.

Beloit College

The statement on liberal education which is published herewith has been developed this year by the chapter of the Association at Beloit College. During the coming summer a committee of the chapter will study the implications of the statement with reference to the curriculum teaching problems and graduation requirements of Beloit College, with a view to future implementation of these aims.

The Aims of Liberal Education

Liberal education is founded upon the doctrine of the potential dignity and worth of the individual human being. Its chief aim therefore is to train the mind and cultivate the spirit of the individual student to the end that he may be prepared to live a full and productive life, in a milieu of freedom conditioned by a sense of moral and social responsibility.

Specifically, liberal education implies the possession of:

- (1) The power to think clearly;
- (2) The knowledge without which thought is impossible; and
- (3) The ideals, personal and social, which give purpose and meaning to thought and action.

Each of these brief statements is comprehensive and includes many contributing factors. Some of these follow.

*1. The Power to Think Clearly**A. Facility in the use of the elementary tools of the mind.*

1. Ability to read, both quickly for general comprehension, and exhaustively and analytically.
2. Ability to speak and write clearly. Thought implies and includes the expression of ideas in an orderly and logical fashion.
3. Comprehension of, and ability to use, symbols other than words, such as those of mathematics, natural sciences, and the arts other than literary.

B. Knowledge of, and skill in applying, methods of thinking.

1. Analysis of a complex situation into component elements.
2. Perception of significant relationships and differences.
3. Organization and synthesis of varied elements into a unified whole.
4. Methods of collecting data and establishing validity.
5. Objective examination of facts, ideas, and opinions, and the formation of critical judgments based on knowledge and insight.
6. Creative imagination.
7. The scientific method, the philosophic method, the aesthetic method.
8. Inductive and deductive methods of reasoning.

(The above are suggestive rather than either comprehensive or mutually exclusive.)

2. *The Knowledge without Which Thought Is Impossible*

Obviously the whole field of knowledge is so vast that no one mind could possibly encompass it in its entirety. As a basis for the selection of subject matter, liberal education presupposes that all knowledge is related, and that thorough knowledge in one field therefore includes some knowledge in many related fields. It further posits that to be liberally educated means to have at least a modicum of knowledge in each of the significant major areas of learning to serve as a frame of reference, plus a fairly thorough and comprehensive knowledge of at least one field.

3. *The Ideals, Personal and Social, Which Give Purpose and Meaning to Thought and Action*

The acquisition of knowledge and skills should be for the primary purpose of enabling the individual to gain a knowledge of himself and other individuals, of society, and of the physical and spiritual universe of which he is a part, in order that, through the possession of such knowledge and skills, he may be able to so adjust himself to his environment, or to so modify that environment, as to be able to function effectively as a human being.

But to function effectively as a human being implies purposeful living rather than mere passive existence. It is therefore a proper and important part of liberal education to help the student to acquire worthy ideals, significant aims toward which his energies may be directed, sound positive attitudes, emotional drives and enthusiasms, and high standards by reference to which value-judgments may be made.

Ideas and ideals, attitudes and drives, should not be inculcated by indoctrination. The significant thing in education is not to force the student to adopt a given point of view but rather to be assured that he understands it. The college should constitute, in the various phases of its work, a laboratory for the demonstration and practice of its fundamental philosophy, for it is only in operation that ideals attain significance.

Some significant ideals are:

1. Religious faith, broadly conceived.
2. Ideals of democracy and freedom.

3. Social awareness combined with moral responsibility.
4. Ideals of truth: the objective acceptance of fact; sincerity and integrity; respect for knowledge.
5. Ideals of beauty and workmanship: thoroughness and dependability in the performance of a task.
6. Conceptions of tolerance, justice and fairness, understanding and respect for the personalities of others, cooperation and ability to function as a member of a group.

Illinois Institute of Technology

At the December 15 meeting of the chapter a review of the year's activities was presented by Professor Paul Copeland, retiring president of the group. Following discussion of the subject, it was voted to appoint a committee comprised of experienced teachers for the purpose of assisting younger members of the staff in solving problems of teaching technique, discipline, etc. It was recommended that the executive committee of the chapter study the recent student poll concerning the teaching ability of the faculty in order that the information gained from the poll could serve as a guide in appointing consultants on teaching for new members of the faculty.

The State University of Iowa

The program of the chapter of the Association for 1943-1944 was concentrated on the promotion of the social welfare of the faculty. At the two meetings on October 21 and December 14, 1943 two different plans for the introduction of hospitalization insurance at the University were discussed. The first—the so-called Mengert Plan—had been worked out by a special committee appointed by the President of the University; it was a "local" plan which would operate without the help of an insurance company and would be limited to staff members and employees of the University of Iowa. Because of legal difficulties this plan could not be adopted and it was decided to advocate the "Blue Cross" Plan which the President of the University recommended in case the Mengert Plan would have to be abandoned. The "Blue Cross" plan was accepted and is now in operation at the University.

The second part of the chapter program was devoted to the consideration of a practical retirement and annuity plan, since

the present retirement plan appears hazardous and may break down if the financial burden connected with it should become too heavy as the number of retired staff members increases. Two new plans were considered. The first plan was based on a special report of the Committee of Economic Welfare of the Association chapter at Iowa State College which the officers of the University chapter and the business manager of the University had discussed with members of the College chapter in a special meeting. A second plan which had been developed by Mr. W. H. Cobb, Business Manager and Secretary of the University, was presented to the chapter in a meeting on February 10, 1944. Among three options with regard to the distribution of contributions: (a) 5% University, 5% faculty member, (b) University pay 10% of salary increase as contribution to fund, (c) University pay all annuity contribution plus 5% salary increase, the second was regarded as most practical. The plan would be obligatory. Annuities are to be purchased by a staff member at x per cent of his basic salary (limit \$5000), summer session salary not to be included. A supplemental benefit carried by the University would have to be provided for staff members near the retirement age.

The President of the University is very much interested in a retirement plan for the faculty; the Board of Education seems to be favorably inclined since it recommended the establishment of the special committees for the three State institutions to investigate the possibilities of such a plan and entrusted one of its own subcommittees with the investigation of this problem. Recent reports indicate that a practical retirement and annuity plan for the institutions of higher learning in Iowa may become operative in the near future.

Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)

At the dinner meeting of the chapter held on June 15, 1943 Dr. James R. Wells presented a summary of the report of the Chairman of Committee E on Organization and Conduct of Chapters which had been published in the February, 1943 *Bulletin*.

The members expressed interest in revising the chapter's constitution so that it might conform with that of the national organiz-

ation. The chapter committee on policies was requested to study the matter and report its findings to the chapter.

The group voted to make a detailed study of salary schedules and related financial problems. A committee was appointed and requested to report early in the next academic year.

University of New Hampshire

The University of New Hampshire chapter held its regular monthly meeting on the evening of February 24. It was held as an open meeting with invitation extended to the entire faculty to attend to acquaint the faculty with the work of the chapter and for the discussion of a topic of immediate concern to nearly all college faculties, namely "Cost of Living Adjustments in Educational Institutions of the United States and Pertinent Data for New Hampshire." The subject was divided into constituent sub-topics, each presented by a member of the committee under the chairmanship of Dr. H. A. Iddles, Professor of Chemistry, as follows: (1) "New Hampshire Legislative Bills Pertaining to Cost of Living Adjustments for State Employees," Dr. Carroll S. Towle, Associate Professor of English; (2) "The Faculty Dollar:" a. "Variations in Cost of Living," Dr. C. S. Parker, Professor of Languages, and b. "Purchasing Power of Faculty Salary," Dr. T. G. Phillips, Professor of Agricultural Chemistry; (3) "Report from a National Survey of State Universities, Land Grant Colleges, and New England Institutions just made by this Chapter," Dr. Iddles, and (4) "Basic Salaries, Additional Increments and Effect of Income Tax on New Hampshire Salaries," Professor M. R. Solt, Associate Professor of Mathematics. Definite conclusion was reached that university and college faculties have not fared well financially since 1939 but no action toward recommendations was taken at this time.

Professor George B. Franklin of Boston University, a member of the national Council, met with the chapter on April 27 and gave a report of the recent Council meetings held in Chicago and Washington. He summarized the discussion of the Council on such subjects as subsidies for higher education, accelerated programs, education for ex-servicemen and women, faculty-administration

relationships, and academic freedom and tenure. General discussion followed during which Professor Franklin replied to a number of questions in which he attempted carefully to reflect the position of the Council.

University of Wisconsin

The chapter's spring dinner meeting on May 10, 1943 was devoted to a discussion of the subject of "The Liberal Arts in the Post-War University." The discussion was presented formally by two scientists: Professor Norris F. Hall of the Department of Chemistry and Professor George S. Bryan of the Department of Botany. Starting from the premise that a long period of stress lies ahead wherein we shall probably maintain a large permanent military establishment and place more emphasis on education for the service of the state, Professor Hall argued that we should need conscious, centrally directed education for leadership; this would mean an adjustment of balance both in science, to remedy the serious lack of technical training at present, and in the humanities. Although stating that the liberal arts would be a necessary part of general education and emphasizing the need of discouraging dilletantism and vocationalism, Professor Hall saw the place of the humanities chiefly in the education of better diplomatists, statesmen, politicians, administrative officers, constitution lawyers, consular agents, and the like, *i. e.*, a class of specialists in government. Professor Bryan, although pessimistic about the immediate future when he thought of the possibility that liberal studies would be crowded to the wall, asserted that he believed that over a long term faith in general humanistic education would reassert itself. The general tenor of the informal discussion which followed was to take issue with Professor Hall's picture of a specialized and somewhat regimented education for the state.

Representatives

The following members represented the American Association of University Professors on the occasions indicated:

A. J. Carlson (University of Chicago) at the inauguration of Dr. Clark George Kuebler as president of Ripon College, December 7.

Irving L. Churchill (Coe College) at the inauguration of Dr. Russell David Cole as president of Cornell College, April 25.

Cyrus L. Day (University of Delaware) at the forty-eighth Annual Meeting of The American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, April 14 and 15.

Ralph E. Himstead, General Secretary of the Association, at a meeting of constituent members of the American Council on Education, May 3-4.

William Jaffé (Northwestern University) at the inauguration of Dr. Ernest A. Johnson as president of Lake Forest College, May 20.

DR Scott (University of Missouri) at the inauguration of Dr. Harry S. Devore as president of Central College, May 25.

Wilson D. Wallis (University of Minnesota) at the inauguration of the Very Reverend Vincent J. Flynn as president of the College of St. Thomas, April 27.

Censured Administrations

Investigations by the American Association of University Professors of the administrations of the several institutions listed below show that they are not observing the generally recognized principles of academic freedom and tenure, endorsed by this Association, the Association of American Colleges, the Association of American Law Schools, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Placing the name of an institution on this list does not mean that censure is visited either upon the whole of the institution or upon the faculty but specifically upon its present administration. The term "administration" includes the administrative officers and the governing board of the institution. This censure does not affect the eligibility of nonmembers for membership in the Association, nor does it affect the individual rights of our members at the institution in question, nor do members of the Association who accept positions on the faculty of an institution whose administration is thus censured forfeit their membership. This list is published for the sole purpose of informing our members, the profession at large, and the public that unsatisfactory conditions of academic freedom and tenure have been found to prevail at these institutions. Names are placed on or removed from this censured list by vote of the Association's Annual Meeting.

The censured administrations together with the date of censuring are listed below. Reports of investigations were published as indicated by the *Bulletin* citations:

Adelphi College, Garden City, New York (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 494-517)	December, 1941
John B. Stetson University, De Land, Florida (October, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 377-399)	December, 1939
University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri (October, 1941 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 478-493)	December, 1941
Memphis State College, Memphis, Tennessee (October, 1943 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 550-580)	April, 1944
Montana State University, Missoula, Montana (<i>Bulletin</i> , April, 1938, pp. 321-348; December, 1939, pp. 578-584; February, 1940, pp. 73-91; December, 1940, pp. 602-606)	December, 1939
West Chester State Teachers College West Chester, Pennsylvania (February, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 44-72)	December, 1939
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania (March, 1935 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 224-266)	December, 1935
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri (December, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 514-535)	December, 1939
State Teachers College, Murfreesboro, Tennessee (December, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 662-677)	May, 1943
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee (June, 1939 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 310-319)	December, 1939
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg, Washington (October, 1940 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 471-475)	December, 1940
Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina (April, 1942 <i>Bulletin</i> , pp. 173-196)	May, 1943

MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to all college and university teachers from the faculties of eligible institutions and to graduate students and graduate assistants. The list of eligible institutions is based primarily on the accredited lists of the established accrediting agencies subject to modification by action of the Association. Election to membership in the Association is by the Committee on Admission of Members upon nomination by one Active Member. Election takes place thirty days after the name of the nominee has been published in the *Bulletin*. The membership year in the Association dates from January 1 through December 31. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received before July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the current year. The membership of nominees whose nominations are received after July 1 becomes effective as of January 1 of the following year unless otherwise requested.

The classes and conditions of membership are as follows:

Active. A person is eligible for election to Active membership if he holds a position of teaching or research with the rank of instructor or higher in an institution on the Association's eligible list, provided his work consists of at least half-time teaching or research. Annual dues are \$4.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Junior. Junior membership is open to persons who are, or within the past five years have been, graduate students in eligible institutions. Junior Members are transferred to Active membership as soon as they become eligible. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Associate. Associate membership is not an elective membership. Active and Junior Members whose work becomes primarily administrative are transferred to Associate membership. Annual dues are \$3.00, including subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Emeritus. Any Active Member retiring for age from a position in teaching or research may be transferred to Emeritus member-

ship. Emeritus Members are exempt from dues. They may continue to receive the *Bulletin* at a special rate of \$1.00 a year.

Life Membership. The Treasurer is authorized by the Council to receive applications from members of the Association for Life membership. The rate is determined in each case on an actuarial basis and includes a life subscription to the *Bulletin*.

Continuing Eligibility. Change of occupation or transfer to an institution not on the Association's eligible list does not affect eligibility for continuance of membership.

Interruption or Termination of Membership. Interruption or termination of membership requires notification to the Association's Washington office. In the absence of such notice, membership continues with receipt of the *Bulletin* for one calendar year during which time there is an obligation to pay dues.

Nominations for Membership

The following 531 nominations for Active membership and 11 nominations for Junior membership are printed as provided by the Constitution. In accordance with action by the Council, objections to any nominee may be addressed to the General Secretary, who will in turn transmit them for the consideration of the Committee on Admission of Members if received within thirty days after this publication. The Council of the Association has ruled that the primary purpose of this provision for protests is to bring to the attention of the Committee any question concerning the technical eligibility of the nominee for membership as provided in the Constitution.

The Committee on Admission of Members consists of Professors Ella Lonn, Goucher College, *Chairman*; B. W. Kunkel, Lafayette College; A. Richards, University of Oklahoma; R. H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania; W. O. Sypherd, University of Delaware; and F. J. Tschan, Pennsylvania State College.

Active

University of Akron, Vaughn W. Floutz, Edward W. Jones, W. H. Lipscombe, Gretchen G. Pahl, Flora E. Wolbach; Alabama College, Edythe Saylor; University of Alabama, Robert L. Driver, Joseph M. Ray, Donald H. Shenk; University of Alaska, Cecilia Cutts; Allegheny College, Dorothy Deach, Alexander C. Kern, John W. McMahan, Charles S. Miller; Amherst College, David Nelson; Arizona State Teachers College (Flagstaff), Robert M. Exner, Gladys M. Fair, Leroy C. Miller; University of Arizona, John

Brooks, Laurence R. Gray, Franz E. Hohn, A. Laurence Muir, Garnet D. Percy, Walter S. Phillips, Leon M. Pultz, Melvin T. Solve, Elzer D. Tetreau, Earle H. Warner; **Atlanta University**, Walter Chivers; **Berea College**, Elisabeth S. Peck; **Boston University**, Henry G. Russell; **Bowling Green State University**, Zane A. Wilson; **Brooklyn College**, Dorothy Alexander, Anna M. Babey, Benjamin Brickman, Monika Kehoe, Carlton H. Reilly, Arthur Secord; **Bryn Mawr College**, Valentine Müller; **Bucknell University**, Malcolm A. Clinger, Philip W. Newton; **University of Buffalo**, Ruth Brendel, L. Grant Rasmussen; **University of California**, Walton E. Bean, Beatrice Cornish, Henry S. Frank, Gerald E. Marsh, Charles G. Patten, Vernon J. Puryear, Aurora M. Quiros, Hans Weltin; **Carnegie Institute of Technology**, Frank C. Ashe, Robert J. Maurer, David Moskovitz, Louise G. Russell, Frederick Seitz; **Case School of Applied Science**, Herbert T. Bates, Carl Bennett, Charles W. Coppersmith, Gerald M. Cover, Eugene C. Crittenden, Jr., Denton T. Doll, Malcolm S. Douglas, Winston M. Dudley, Lewis R. Lowe, Sidney W. McCuskey, Max Morris, Leonard O. Olsen, Thurston D. Owens, Russell C. Putnam, Webster C. Roberts, Lawrence G. Seigel, Carl K. Seyfert, J. Reid Shelton, Robert L. Shurter, Charles S. Smith, Jr., George L. Tuve, William E. Umbach, Francis M. Whitacre, Herbert R. Young; **Centenary College of Louisiana**, Marguerite Topper; **Centre College of Kentucky**, Mary Sweeney; **University of Chicago**, Walter Johnson, Harley F. MacNair, Robert V. Merrill; **University of Cincinnati**, Carl A. Ludeke, Ian R. MacGregor, Meyer Salkover; **The City College (New York)**, Harry de Girolamo, Samuel Hendel, Joseph L. Mendelis, Ellis L. Raesly; **The City College (Commerce Center)**, Frank A. Thornton; **Clark University**, Dwight E. Lee; **Colorado College**, Robert Gross; **Colorado School of Mines**, Robert A. Baxter, Edward B. Jacobs, J. Harlan Johnson; **Columbia University**, Dorothy Brewster, Abraham Wald; **University of Connecticut**, Carl F. Fischer, Raymond A. Ross, C. A. Weber; **Dartmouth College**, Sidney Cox, Vernon Hall, Jr., Royal C. Nemiah; **University of Dayton**, Lee O. Lantis; **University of Delaware**, John F. Davis, Abraham B. Soble; **De Paul University**, Robert F. Fries; **Drexel Institute of Technology**, Flora B. Jones; **University of Florida**, Kliem Alexander, William A. Gager; **Franklin College of Indiana**, Elsie MacGregor; **Fresno State College**, Helen F. Rohrer, Winston Strong, John W. Wright; **Furman University**, Frances M. Bailey, Francis W. Simpson; **George Washington University**, Georgette D. Caskie, Sidney B. Hall; **Georgia School of Technology**, Evart L. Bowers, Roy A. James; **University of Georgia**, John F. Burke, Robert S. Cornish; **Goucher College**, Matilda M. Ernst, Alice J. Reynolds; **Hamline University**, Lowell Bobleter, Russell J. Compton, Hortense H. Deinard, Edith I. Felien, Doris B. Garey, Ingfried Haskins, Edward C. Roeber, Richard O. Sielatt; **Hampton Institute**, M. Evelyn Lawlah; **Hiram College**, Howard E. Short; **Hobart College**, Stuart G. Cole, Kathryn G. Dapp, Eloise Wood; **Hunter College**, Octavie Arnaud, Joseph C. Bailey, Josephine M. Burke, Mae A. Burns, James G. Clapp, Gertrude Delahunt, Martin J. Freeman, Beatrice F. Hyslop, Pearl Kibre, Rosalind S. Langsam, Claire McGlinchee, Madge McLain, Jacquelin A. MacNaughton, Bernice L. Maclean,

Eleanor B. Marr, S. Etta Schreiber, Henrietta Tichy, Margaret C. Tilley, Marie L. Vagts; **College of Idaho**, Paul Murphy; **University of Idaho**, Marguerite B. Doré, Alfred C. Dunn, Robert E. Hosack, Mabel Morris; **University of Idaho (Southern Branch)**, Meir Pilch; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, Alfred C. Ames; **Southern Illinois Normal University**, Sherman B. Barnes, Jesse W. Harris; **University of Illinois**, John H. Rappalie; **State University of Iowa**, Jack A. Posin, Fred K. Schaefer; **Johns Hopkins University**, Joseph W. Hickman, Waldemar T. Ziegler; **Kansas State College**, Louis M. Jorgenson, George W. Maxwell; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Daphne V. Cross, L. C. Guffey, David D. Moore, Velda M. Williams; **University of Kansas City**, Charles E. Fiddler, Robert H. Hubbard, James F. Lewis; **Lawrence College**, Bernard E. Heselton; **Lincoln University (Missouri)**, Rubye H. Gill; **Southwestern Louisiana Institute**, Leo M. Favrot, Jr.; **Louisiana State Normal College**, Doris E. Whitney; **Louisiana State University**, Roy Ashmen, Roy E. Hyde; **University of Louisville**, Marjorie Jenkins; **Madison College**, John VanMale, Glada B. Walker, Margarete Woelfel; **University of Maine**, Byron Fairchild; **Mars Hill College**, Isaac N. Carr; **Mary Washington College**, Sallie B. Harrison, Emil R. Schnellock, Jane G. Scranton; **Western Maryland College**, Charles E. Gauss, Thomas F. Marshall, David L. Zyve; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, Karl W. Deutsch, Alfred S. Tucker; **Michigan State College**, Paul D. Bagwell, Charles D. Ball, Carl W. Carlson, Oscar W. Fairbanks, Joseph A. Foster, George R. Heath, Dorothy A. Kerth, Faye Kinder, Wilbur L. Mitchell, John R. Park, Joseph W. Stack, William R. Sur, Ronald M. Warren, Howard E. Winters; **University of Michigan**, Elizabeth C. Crosby, Ella E. McNeil, Herbert C. Youtie; **Minnesota State Teachers College (Duluth)**, Gladys Barber, Jackson K. Ehlert, Miriam Gunter, Zabo J. V. Harvalik, Grace A. Klein, Mollie Korgen, Beulah M. Larson, John McConaughy, Edith M. Peterson, Margaret W. St. George, Dorothy D. Smith, Flora M. Staple, Helen Urquhart, Virginia Willcuts; **University of Minnesota**, Gertrude M. Baker, William G. Clark, Marguerite Guinotte, Katharine M. Maurer, Ralph E. Miller; **Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy**, Karl K. Kershner; **Northwest Missouri State Teachers College**, Edwin L. Godfrey, Lawrence E. Wilkins; **Southwest Missouri State Teachers College**, Claude M. Dillinger, Glenn E. Karls; **University of Missouri**, Helge E. Ederstrom, James B. Hamilton, Melvin H. Marx, Silvio Muschera, Lloyd B. Thomas; **Montana School of Mines**, Morton C. Smith; **Mount Holyoke College**, Marion H. Gillim, Edith S. Rostas, Julia M. Shipman; **Mount Union College**, Willard Pederson; **Multnomah College**, Neil M. Coventry, Una V. Davies, Walter A. Hatch, May L. Heitkemper; **Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne)**, Martha Smith; **University of Nebraska**, Walter K. Beggs; **University of Nevada**, Leonard E. Chadwick, Alden J. Plumley, Albert G. Wiederhold; **New England Conservatory of Music**, Charles Dennée, Marie L. A. Gillet, Leo W. Hayek, Percy F. Hunt, Laura B. Mallett, John D. Murray, Marie Sundelius; **University of New Hampshire**, Sylvester H. Bingham, Edmond W. Bowler, Arnold W. Green, Eric T. Huddleston, John D. Ifft, Arthur W. Johnson, Irene L. Ladd, Harold I. Leavitt, Ford S. Prince; **New Mexico**

Highlands University, Ralph P. Frazier; University of New Mexico, Conrad K. Naegle, William J. Parish, Herschel R. Snodgrass; New York Medical College, Rosario Terranova, Charles A. Woerner; New York State College for Teachers, C. Luther Andrews, Blanche M. Avery, Ralph G. Clausen, Mary E. Conklin, Edward L. Cooper, M. Annette Dobbin, Gertrude E. Douglas, Elaine Forsyth, Robert W. Frederick, Agnes Futterer, James Gemmell, Mary G. Goggin, Floyd E. Henrickson, Clarence A. Hidley, Vivian C. Hopkins, Ruth E. Hutchins, Mabel E. Jackman, Helen C. James, J. Isabelle Johnston, Alice M. Kirkpatrick, Oscar E. Lanford, Sara H. MacGonagle, Shields McIlwain, Gottfried F. Merkel, Carleton A. Moose, Mildred R. Nielsen, Catharine W. Peltz, Arline F. Preston, John R. Roach, Ruth Sabol, Henry L. Sisk, Frances K. Slater, Daniel W. Snader, Esther L. Stallmann, Charles F. Stokes, Wallace W. Taylor, Chester J. Terrill, Harrison M. Terwilliger, Lucy Wheeler, Katherine E. Wheeling, George M. York; New York University, Abraham I. Katsh, Isaac Neuwirth, Arthur Scholten; North Carolina College for Negroes, Charles A. Ray, Benner C. Turner; University of North Carolina, Robert Ginell; Oberlin College, Orville C. Jones; Ohio State University, David R. Dodd, William H. Ewing, Arthur M. Wellington; Ohio Wesleyan University, Georgia M. Haswell, Edith C. Stevens; East Central State College of Oklahoma, John G. Mackin; University of Oklahoma, J. R. Chandler, Ruth E. Elder, W. Hansen Hall, Charles E. Harp, Mary H. Marable, Anthony S. Reiner, Maxine Richardson, Wendell S. Taylor; Oregon State College, Andrew J. Grajdanzev; University of Oregon, Jean Kendall, Peter O. Sigerseeth, Henry E. Stevens, Kenneth S. Wood, Janet Woodruff; College of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, Irving Rehman; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (West Chester), Gerald Keenan; University of Pennsylvania, Louis C. W. Baker, Matthew W. Black, Leonidas Dodson, Robert H. Elias, Gregory G. LaGrone, Gayle K. Lawrence, John J. Reed, Miguel Romera-Navarro, Leonard I. Schiff, Chester G. Stocker, Viola Theman, Carl A. Thomas, Joseph G. Tregle, Jr., Bernard B. Watson, Roy G. Williams, Frederick M. Worley; Phoenix Junior College, Euclid Smith; University of Pittsburgh, Ralph K. Beamer, Walter Sobotka, Waclaw T. Szymanowski; Princeton University, Alfred C. S. Baird, Richard Bellman, Edward C. Campbell, Leo P. Crespi, Dana G. Munro, Orhan S. Ozdemir, Robert N. Pease, Newton L. Pierce, Edmund Silberner, John W. Tukey, Richard H. Wilhelm; University of Puerto Rico, Julio García-Díaz; Purdue University, R. L. Anderson; Reed College, Frank H. Hurley, Dorothy O. Johansen; Ripon College, Albert M. Johnson, Ruth A. Strandberg; University of Rochester, Hippocrates G. Apostle; Rose Polytechnic Institute, Edward H. Eckerman; Rutgers University, Robert B. Kleinschmidt, Franklin Miller, Jr.; St. Louis University, Cornelius K. Cain, Edwin E. Hays; Salem College, Noble R. McEwen; San Francisco State College, Mary MacWilliam; San Jose State College, Anne S. Aller, William H. Myers, William H. Poytress; Seton Hill College, Paul F. Kromer; Skidmore College, Eleanor Dobkin, Doris F. Lake; Medical College of the State of South Carolina, Elmer D. Bueker, Max D. Wheatley; University of South Carolina, James M. Ariail; South Dakota State College, Joseph

A. Giddings, C. May Overton; **University of Southern California**, Eleazer Lecky; **Southwestern Medical College**, Sol Haberman; **Stowe Teachers College**, Charles E. Scott; **Sul Ross State Teachers College**, Mary S. Elliott; **Sweet Briar College**, Arnold A. Del Greco; **Syracuse University**, Agnes G. Raymond; **Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State Teachers College**, Merl R. Eppse; **Middle Tennessee State College**, Brainard B. Gracy, Jr., Clayton L. James, Elizabeth B. Schardt, J. C. Waller; **Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas**, Frederick W. Hensel, Loyd B. Keel, James C. Miller, John W. Overall, Charles H. Puckett; **Texas State College for Women**, Josh P. Roach; **East Texas State Teachers College**, Eddie M. Burson, Troy C. Crenshaw, Betty Klemmer, Closs Pickren; **Southwest Texas State Teachers College**, Hugh F. Wilson; **University of Texas**, Edgar F. Bennett, Patrik Butler, Lawrence Carra, Alice L. Cooke, Ruth A. C. Foster, Wilson Little, Alexander Masley, Henry Wunderlich; **Tufts College**, John M. Ratcliffe; **Tulane University**, Guy A. Cardwell, Jr., Russel M. Geer; **Union College**, H. Gilbert Harlow, Sidney B. Smith; **United States Naval Academy**, Oliver L. I. Brown, C. Russell Phelps; **Ursinus College**, John W. Clawson, Helen Garrett, John J. Heilemann, Eugene H. Miller, Alfred M. Wilcox; **Utah State Agricultural College**, W. Preston Thomas, Ethelwyn B. Wilcox, Rachael B. Yocom; **University of Utah**, Roald F. Campbell, J. R. Mahoney, Jessie Perry, Le Conte Stewart, Roland Stucki, O. Meredith Wilson; **Medical College of Virginia**, Charles W. Morhart, Peter N. Pastore; **Virginia State College for Negroes**, William L. Watson; **Virginia Union University**, Louis F. Jeffries, Lawrence B. Robinson; **University of Virginia**, Raymond Uhl; **Wabash College**, Neil C. Hutsinpillar; **Eastern Washington College of Education**, Obed Williamson; **Western Washington College of Education**, Orpha Christenson, Fred W. Knapman; **State College of Washington**, John A. Guthrie, Mildred B. Wohlford; **Washington University**, John H. Van Dyke; **University of Washington**, Russell Blankenship, Helen A. Kahin, Kathleen M. Leahy, Kathleen Munro, William H. Pierson, Florence B. Wilson, Edith Woodcock; **Wayne University**, Harold Stewart; **Wells College**, John G. Rideout; **West Virginia University**, Kenneth Bell, George A. Bowling, Forrest F. Carhart, Jr., Frances P. DeLancy, J. Clark Easton, O. Rex Ford, Harry M. Fridley, Ray S. Marsh, Ruth D. Noer, I. Dee Peters, Wilson B. Sayers, Vivian Sorelle, Richard H. Sudds, Charles H. Vehse, Kyle C. Westover, Ralph Wherry; **West Virginia Wesleyan College**, Nicholas Hyma; **Western Reserve University**, Mildred Danklefsen, Fay Fisher, Nadine Miles, Joseph Remenyi; **Wheaton College (Massachusetts)**, Grazia Avitable, Emeline H. Hill, Helene Riegner, Myrtle A. Stuntzner; **Whitworth College**, Charles J. Tilley; **Municipal University of Wichita**, Carroll W. Bryant, Walter J. Duerksen; **Willamette University**, Lewis Pankasie, Stephen C. Smith; **College of William and Mary**, Annie G. Dix, Hughes B. Hoyle, Jr., Margaret C. Phillips; **Winthrop College**, Blanche C. Badger, William V. Badger, Dorothy T. L. Chamings, Isla Ellerbe, Dorothy Jones, Evelyn G. Tibbits; **Wisconsin State Teachers College (La Crosse)**, William B. Conner, John R. Darling; **University of Wisconsin**, Laura B. Johnson, Kenneth Little, Norman P. Neal, Roland A. Ragatz, Leroy

A. Wilson; Yale University, William Cornyn; Yankton College, Lorne S. Arnold.

Junior

Cornell University, Frank W. Merritt; Indiana University, Bryant M. French, Suzanne Gibbs, Gerald R. Graham, Ludwig Immergluck, Ruth Riemer; New England Conservatory of Music, Jeannette Giguère, Dowell P. McNeil; New York State College for Teachers, Frieda Klaiman, John C. Tanno; University of Pittsburgh, John G. Christiano.

Members Elected

The Committee on Admission of Members announces the election of 515 Active and 7 Junior Members as follows:

Active

Adelphi College, Wilbert S. Ray; University of Akron, Boris W. Boguslavsky, Jean Clayton, Howard M. Doult, Dallas L. Downing, A. John B. Fairburn, Harry K. Foster, Bethuel Gross, William C. Henry, Donato Internoscia, Lucille D. Lamkin, Elizabeth A. Lathrop, John A. McClure, Gladys Robinson, Paul C. Smith, Clarence R. Upp, Sumner Vanica, B. Evangeline Witzeman; Alabama State Teachers College (Jacksonville), Robert P. Felgar, Lance J. Hendrix; University of Alabama, Russell C. Larcom; University of Alaska, Roy E. Swift; Albion College, Dorothy G. Engle, Thorrel B. Fest, H. Eugene Geiger, Carroll P. Lahman, George G. Rathje; Arizona State Teachers College (Flagstaff), Byrd Burton, Kenneth E. Derifield, Cornelia Dockstader, William E. Gregory, Merton W. Jones, James J. Lynch, Junia E. McAlister, Ralph Pryor, D. Ross Pugmire, Minnie Roseberry, Henry P. Smith, Clyde W. Tombaugh, R. E. Tucker; Arizona State Teachers College (Tempe), Samuel Burkhard, Tom Harter, Rudolf Lavik; University of Arkansas (Medical School), Michael Laskowski, Howard H. Rostorfer; Ball State Teachers College, Oliver C. Bumb, Otto B. Christy, Alan W. Huckleberry, Claude E. Palmer, Lawrence J. Scheidler; Baylor University, James W. Dixon, Jr., Katie McCluney, Leila Park, Arthur W. Smith, Albert M. Winchester; Berea College, Esther L. Beck, Robert H. Blaker, M. Lenore Lytle, Clara B. Rice, Claude O. Spillman, Theodore M. Wright; Boston University, Robert P. Benedict, Roger C. Crafts, Leland C. Wyman; Bowling Green State University, Wayne F. Cornell; Bradley Polytechnic Institute, P. R. McIntosh; Brooklyn College, Ida S. Susseles; Bucknell University, Erle B. Ayres; Bucknell University Junior College, Robert L. Nicholson; University of California (Los Angeles), Bradford A. Booth, James Murray; Carleton College, Robert W. McEwen; Carroll College (Wisconsin), Dorothy Welker; Carthage College, Merle W. Boyer; Case School of Applied Science, Edward J. R. Hudce, William A. Lynam, Daniel K. Wright, Jr.; Catawba College, Russell F. W.

Smith, Christopher J. Thomas; **University of Chicago**, A. Cornelius Benjamin, Erwin F. Beyer, Henry S. Bloch, John S. Bells, Jr., John C. Gerber, Lawrence M. Graves, John Hutchens, Wellington D. Jones, Morris A. Lipton, Francis E. McMahon, Albert M. Potts, Henry E. Stanton, Julian M. Tobias, Gustave E. Von Grunebaum; **The City College (New York)**, Rafael A. Becerra, Albert C. Friend, Truly C. Hardy, Hyman Krakower, S. A. Rhodes; **Coe College**, David I. Berger; **Colgate University**, Glenn E. Waas; **Colorado School of Mines**, Paul H. Keating; **University of Colorado**, Edna L. Furness; **Columbia University**, John E. Englund, Nathaniel Pepper; **Connecticut College**, Jean V. Johnston; **University of Connecticut**, Mordecai L. Gabriel, Helen R. Moseley; **Cornell College**, Winifred M. Van Etten; **Cornell University**, Perry W. Gilbert; **University of Delaware**, Margaret P. Allison, Evelyn H. Clift, D. Ulrich Greenwald, Theodore A. Jackson, Wilson Kleibacker, Michael A. Kubico, Mildred E. Reyner, Harry C. Stumpf, Milton G. Young; **University of Denver**, Leslie C. Tihany; **DePaul University**, Walter A. Eggert, Joseph G. Phoenix; **DePauw University**, Joseph McMenamin; **Emory University**, Nancy J. Day; **Evansville College**, Joe Park; **Findlay College**, Leonard T. Stratton; **Fisk University**, George N. Redd; **Florida Normal and Industrial Institute**, Anthony W. Gaines; **Florida State College for Women**, Wallace M. True; **University of Florida**, Robert O. Stripling; **Fresno State College**, Elton M. Baker, Alice K. Bell, Lilah Bradford, Mitchell P. Briggs, Verner D. Delaney, Eugenia R. Esdorn; **Georgia School of Technology**, William C. Bornmann; **Georgia State Woman's College**, Lola M. Drew, Aileen Schoeppe; **Haverford College**, Maylon H. Hepp; **University of Hawaii**, Charles J. Engard; **Hillsdale College**, Elsie Rowe; **Hobart College**, Judith Pool; **Hollins College**, Ivar L. Myhr; **Hunter College**, Frederika Beatty, Florence Dalton, Bertha M. Masche; **Illinois Institute of Technology**, Lewis A. Dexter, Howard P. Vincent, Henry J. Webb; **Southern Illinois Normal University**, Edward C. McDonagh; **Illinois State Normal University**, Wezette A. Hayden, Erma F. Imboden, Ernest M. R. Lamkey, L. Wallace Miller, Alice R. Ogle, Wayne F. Sherrard; **University of Illinois**, Joseph Allen, Jr.; **Indiana University**, Donald E. Bowman, Harold R. Hulpieu, Newell H. Long, Mary B. Owen, Donald W. Prakken, Charles Prince, Lyle A. Weed, F. Joachim Weyl, Oscar O. Winther; **Iowa State College**, Gertrude E. Chittenden, Noel H. Gross, Harold Gunderson, Myrtle Haughn, William G. Murray; **State University of Iowa**, Gregory H. Wannier; **John Carroll University**, Edwin F. Gilchrist; **Kansas State College**, Edward R. DeZurko, John W. Greene, Richard R. Jeson, George Montgomery; **Fort Hays Kansas State College**, Alvin H. Proctor, Earl G. Swafford; **Kansas State Teachers College (Pittsburg)**, Jarvis Burner; **University of Kansas**, Allen Crafton, Leland J. Pritchard; **Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College**, Presley M. Grise; **University of Kentucky**, Charles Barkenbus, Carl C. Branson, Dana G. Card, Graham B. Dimmick, Arthur C. McFarlan, Laura K. Martin, Ruth Sneed, Charles E. Snow, Simon H. Wender; **Kenyon College**, Joseph S. Jackson; **Knox College**, Clarence E. Deakins, Cameron King, J. E. Morton, Hermann R. Muelder, Rothwell Stephens; **Lafayette College**, Ralph N. Schmidt; **LaSalle College**, John A. Guischard;

Lincoln University (Missouri), Alan T. Busby, H. Hadley Hartshorn, Melbourne C. Langford; Linfield College, James H. Pollard; McGill University, John H. Holden; Macalester College, Anselm Fisher; Marquette University, Victor M. Hamm; Mary Washington College, Roy B. Bowers, Hobart C. Carter, Ronald Faulkner, William W. Griffith, Lyle S. Hiatt, Earl G. Insley, Fred E. Miller, Carrol H. Quenzel; University of Maryland, Paul F. Bartunek, Sidney F. Borg, Carl L. Davis, Dudley Dillard, Oliver G. Harne, John C. Krantz, Jr., Robert H. Oster; Maryville College, Dorothy Horne; University of Miami, James C. Braddock, Philip W. Carter, Mary C. Clarke, Pedro R. Hiribarne; Western Michigan College of Education, Jefferson D. Swinebroad; Michigan State College, Edith Butler, Charles G. Danforth, Irma M. Felber, Marjorie Gesner, Elton B. Hill, Guy H. Hill, Albert J. Huggett, Oran M. Knudsen, Hans Leonhardt, Cecil V. Millard, Bert E. O'Beirne, George R. Price, Berwyn M. Robinson, Malcolm M. Williams; University of Michigan, Arno L. Bader, Saul L. Cohen, Arthur C. Curtis, Lee R. Dice, Warren R. Good, Walter W. J. Gores, Morris Greenhut, Amos H. Hawley, Reuben L. Kahn, George Kiss, Vaden W. Miles, LeRoy M. Weir; Mills College, Mary W. Bennett, Luther B. Marchant, Grayson Schmidt; University of Minnesota, J. O. Christianson, Eva Donelson, Herbert G. Heneman, Jr.; Mississippi Southern College, Herd C. Steele; Missouri School of Mines and Metallurgy, Dickran H. Erkiletian, Jr.; Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, George H. Jamison; Northwest Missouri State Teachers College, John G. Strong; University of Missouri, E. Maurice Bloch, Lewis E. Hahn, Harold E. Hardy, Lawrence M. Hepple, Cecil H. Miller, Willis Moore; Montana State Normal College, Rush Jordan; Montreal University, Gustav A. Mokrzycki; Morningside College, James E. Kirkpatrick; Mount Holyoke College, Norma Adams, Marcia L. Anderson, Eugenia Hanfmann, Gloria Ladiou, Gertrude L. Lippincott, Edith Runge, Charlotte G. Wells, Evelyn M. Yellow Robe; Mount Union College, William R. Locke, Corinne Mullins, Chester T. Ruddick; Nebraska State Teachers College (Kearney), Jennie M. Conrad; Nebraska State Teachers College (Wayne), Morris B. Street; University of Nebraska, John L. Champe, Joseph J. Kwiat; University of Nevada, Philip G. Auchampaugh; New England Conservatory of Music, Kurt Fischer, Anna S. Lothian, Gladys C. Miller, Simone Rivière, Norine Robards, Alice E. Whitehouse, Susan Williams; University of New Hampshire, Kenneth J. Arnold, Dawson G. Fulton, Ruth Kelly, William L. Kichline; New Jersey State Teachers College (Paterson), M. Herbert Freeman; New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, J. V. Boyd, Raymond A. Dorsett, R. Donald Millican, Naoma Peninger, F. Robert Poole, Laura Van Snow, Lawrence Yates; University of New Mexico, John G. Breiland, Lolita H. Pooler; College of New Rochelle, Bernard J. Kohlbrenner; New York Medical College, David Lehr; New York State College for Teachers, James A. Hicks, C. Currien Smith; New York State Teachers College (Brockport), Douglas S. Brown, George S. Queen; North Carolina College for Negroes, John H. Franklin, Stephen J. Wright; East Carolina Teachers College (North Carolina), Carl L. Adams, Bartholomew B. Brandt, Ralph C. Deal, Wendell W. Smiley; Woman's

College of the University of North Carolina, Robert H. Dalton; University of North Dakota, Wilson M. Laird; Northwestern University, R. E. Wolseley; University of Notre Dame, T. Bowyer Campbell, James Corbett, Waldemar Gurian, Joseph Landin, John Nims, Alvan S. Ryan, W. Roy Utz; Oberlin College, Robert S. Fletcher, Carl C. W. Nicol, Paul P. Rogers, George T. Scott, Ralph H. Singleton; Ohio Wesleyan University, C. E. Van Sickle, Gerald W. Young; University of Oklahoma, John Barnard; Oregon State College, Vernon H. Cheldelin, Clifford E. Maser; Pennsylvania College for Women, Gertrude Ayars, Lois E. Kramer; Pennsylvania State Teachers College (West Chester), Helen A. Russell; University of Pennsylvania, Arthur W. Burks, Raymond T. Bye, Thomas P. Haviland, Jeremiah Lockwood, Edward N. Wright; University of Pittsburgh, L. K. Darbaker, Edward P. Claus, John P. M. Marsalka, Leo S. Mason, Hans W. Weigert; University of Puerto Rico, Antonio Rodriguez, Jr., Néstor I. Vincenty; Purdue University, Orville C. Cromer, Paul Erdős, Betty Lark-Horovitz, George V. Mueller, Leland Winch, Karl D. Wood, George S. Wykoff, Elsie Yehling; Queens College (North Carolina), Gilbert L. Lycan; University of Redlands, Bess P. Adams, George J. Hollenberg, David L. Soltau; Rhode Island State College, George Brooks; Ripon College, Leone Oyster; St. Lawrence University, Milton L. Barron, E. Kenneth Carpenter, Wilbur C. Getz; St. Michael's College, John C. Hartnett; Salem College, Arley T. Curlee; San Diego State College, Paul M. Tinsley; San Jose State College, Josephine Chandler, Lyman H. Daugherty, Earnest S. Greene, Harry T. Jensen, Lawrence C. Mendenhall, Harold P. Miller, William G. Sweeney; Seton Hill College, John Biller, Margaret Garrity; Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota), R. G. Dahl; Southwestern Medical College, Robert M. Pike, S. Edward Sulkin; Stanford University, Sydney Ross; Sweet Briar College, Lysbeth W. Muncy; Syracuse University, Wesley C. Clark, Eleanor E. Hanlon, James E. Maynard; Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State Teachers College, Alger V. Boswell; Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, John Ashton, Samuel M. Cleland, Martin C. Hughes, J. Lambert Molyneaux, Clifford H. Ransdell, Claris B. Ray, Duncan H. Reid, Elmer G. Smith, Gordon S. Stiles, Harold Vance, Wallace T. Wait, Charles G. Whitwell; Texas College of Arts and Industries, Duane D. Smith; Texas State College for Women, A. Elizabeth Taylor; Southwest Texas State Teachers College, Don Cude, J. E. Douglas; University of Texas, Graydon L. Ausmus, Edward H. Frieden, Grover A. Fuchs, Robert H. Gregory, Hubert B. Jones, Hugo Leipziger-Pearce, William L. Lester, Harvey C. Slocum, Charles Umlauf; Tufts College, Crosby F. Baker, John Breakwell, Paul Doleman, Alfred S. Cole, Robert D. Eddy, LeRoy P. Graf, George N. Halm, George H. Hammond, Arthur C. Hoffman, John T. Holden, Edward H. Howard, Laurence LaForge, J. Chester Littlefield, Charles R. Mingins, Marshall Newton, Kenneth D. Roeder, Samuel R. Scholes, Jr., Carl A. Stevens, Kenneth S. Wagoner, Rolland E. Wolfe; Tulane University, Cyril Feldstein; Union College, Anthony Hoadley; Utah State Agricultural College, Theodore M. Burton, Victor Church, Francis M. Coe, Paul T. Gilbert, Jr., H. Reuben Reynolds; University of Utah, Julius B. Bearnson, William H.

Behle, Leland H. Creer, Royal L. Garff, Randall E. Hamm, Franklin S. Harris, Jr., Howard J. Hassell, Elizabeth R. Hayes, Helen Marshall, George Pierson, Heber G. Richards, Dilworth Walker; Villanova College, Rudolf Drenick, Leo H. Schaefer, Jacob Yavitch; Virginia State Teachers College (Farmville), LeRoy C. Merritt; Central Washington College of Education, Doris A. Anderson, John A. Behrenbrinker, Lucile Cypreansen, Dorothy L. MacDonald, Loretta M. Miller, Ruth L. Woods; State College of Washington, E. Arlean Pattison, H. Jeannette Winter; Washington University, Marion Bernard; University of Washington, Walter F. Hiltner, Blanche Payne, William F. Thompson; Wayne University, Bradford N. Craver, H. Warren Dunham, Wilson McTeer, George A. Peck, Herbert Schueller; Wells College, Raymond de Roover; Wesleyan University, José Gómez-Ibáñez; West Liberty State College, Kenneth Spaulding; West Virginia University, J. Ned Bryan, Jr., Charles D. Thomas; West Virginia Wesleyan College, Jacob Bos, William C. Dawn, Arthur B. Gould, James E. Judson, Rachel C. Ogden, Leta Snodgrass, Heyward A. Williams; Western College, Jeanne Behrend, Peter J. Hampton, Florence G. Marsh, Mary T. Swickard; Western Reserve University, Gerhard Krebs, Audrey Sims; Westminster College (Pennsylvania), Eva Goodenough, Elsie Leffingwell; Municipal University of Wichita, Ralph M. Graham, J. Ray Hanna, Clarence G. Stuckwisch, Edward B. Wedel; College of William and Mary, Evelyn M. Acomb, Emily E. Calkins, Hubert J. Davis, Althea Hunt, Spartaco V. Monello, John C. Strickland, Jr., Carl M. Voyles; Winthrop College, Harriet R. Holman; University of Wisconsin, Elinor Soulé; College of Wooster, John A. Hutchison; University of Wyoming, Jennie E. Craig.

Transfers from Junior to Active

The City College (New York), Otto F. Steinbach; Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, Carleton F. Waite.

Junior

University of Connecticut, Ingeborg Greeff; Indiana University, Robert H. Irrmann; University of Michigan, Edward Calver, William W. Taylor, John Weimer; Northern State Teachers College (South Dakota), Edyth E. Barry; Wayne University, Gordon Klopff.

Academic Vacancies and Teachers Available

To assist in the placement of college and university teachers the American Association of University Professors publishes notices of academic vacancies and of teachers available. It is optional with appointing officers and teachers to publish their names and addresses or to use key numbers. If a key number is used those interested should address letters of inquiry for forwarding in care of the General Secretary, American Association of University Professors, 1155 Sixteenth Street, N. W., Washington 6, D. C.

Vacancies Reported

Chemistry, Chemical Engineering, Metallurgy, Bacteriology, and allied fields: Positions of research and development work with the American Cyanamid Company. Applicants should write to Mr. S. B. Carpenter, Personnel Department, American Cyanamid Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York City.

Economics: Government agency is seeking well qualified, experienced research analysts in economics, marketing, international trade, economic geography, statistics and related fields. Presumption of permanence. Salaries, \$4000-\$7000.

V 1109

Languages (Russian, German, Italian, Dano-Norwegian, Chinese, and combination of minor languages): Translators, some interpreting, permanent government agency. Beginning salary, \$2600.

V 1110

Applications or inquiries regarding the positions listed below should be addressed to Mr. Albert W. Staub, American Director, Near East College Association, 50 West 50th Street, New York City.

Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey

Professor of Mathematics to teach engineering school mathematics, including calculus and differential equations

Professor of Civil Engineering, experienced in surveying, in railway curves, in earth work, and in highway engineering

Associate Professor of Civil Engineering, specializing in hydraulics, water supply, and sanitation

Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering, head of department, experienced especially in theory and design of electrical power machinery

Instructors in Mechanical Engineering and Mathematics

Instructor in Science for the Academy Department

Associate Professor of Chemistry and Instructor in Chemistry and Physics

Instructors (3) in English

American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

Associate Professor of Mathematics

Associate Professor of Physics

Associate Professor of Civil Engineering

Instructors (3) in English

Nurses (Surgical Supervisor and Night Supervisor)

American College for Girls, Istanbul, Turkey (preparatory department)

Instructors (2) in English
 Instructor in Mathematics
 Instructor in Science
 Instructor in Physical Education

The following vacancies have been reported in a southern college for women:

Art: Assistant Professor, acting head of department. Young woman, M.F.A., minimum. Duration position. V 1111
 English and Drama: Instructor. Practical coaching in dramatics. Permanent position. V 1112
 Modern Languages: Professor and acting head of department. Man, Ph.D. Permanent position. V 1113
 Science: Instructor. Young woman, major in botany and minor in biology. Permanent position. V 1114

In the girls' preparatory school administered by the above college there are vacancies for young women to teach the following subjects: French and Spanish, Physical Education, History, English and Dramatics, and Mathematics.

Spanish: Well known midwestern college of liberal arts needs instructor, preferably native American, to administer experiment in teaching Spanish on a laboratory basis. Candidates must have outstanding teaching ability with Spanish as principal field. Position offers good chance for young instructor to establish himself and gain recognition. V 1115

Teachers Available

Art: Woman, single, recent graduate work toward doctor's degree at Columbia University. M.A. and A.B. degrees from middle-western universities. Travel and study abroad. Produces and exhibits art work. Six years' experience in both fine arts and art education for university laboratory school as well as art teaching for college and university levels. Character above reproach. Good recommendations. A 2125

Botany and Zoology: Young woman, B.S., M.S., postgraduate work in plant morphology. Six years of very successful teaching in a leading junior college. Considerable camp experience. Would consider position as dean of women or one offering opportunity to do guidance work. A 2126

Economics and History (specialization in economic theory and history of economic thought, economic history, economic geography, labor economics, general economics, American history): Man, 26, single, draft deferred. B.S.S., 1940; M.A., 1942; completing Ph.D. requirements. Four teaching licenses New York City and State high school systems in economics, economic geography and social studies. High school and college teaching experience; 2½ years of social research laboratory work. Now holds senior graduate assistantship and also teaching assistantship in large eastern university. Desires college teaching position offering professional advancement. Available for summer or fall, 1944. A 2127

- Education: M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University; Doctorate, University of Missouri; married, above draft. Fifteen years' experience educational administration and supervision. Specialist junior college and general education field. Phi Delta Kappa. Contributor educational periodicals. Desires teaching in administration or teacher training. Immediately available. A 2128
- Education: Man, 42, married, Ph.D., Michigan. Minor, social sciences. Wide experience. Available on 30-day notice. A 2129
- English: Woman, 35, Ph.D. Phi Beta Kappa, A.A.U.W. fellowship abroad. Eight years' teaching, college and college preparatory. Now teaching private school and university extension. Publications. A 2130
- English: Man, 39, married, Ph.D., Harvard. Phi Beta Kappa. Ten years of university teaching. Desires permanent, advanced position at institution where teaching itself is considered important. Publications, book ready for press. Excellent recommendations. A 2131
- English and Comparative Literature: Man, married, 39, Harvard M.A. in English and American, Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, main emphasis on French, German, Italian relations with English literature. Educated in Switzerland, Sorbonne, Harvard, Yale. Steady research, ample publications, vigorous personality, long teaching experience. Good recommendations teacher, scholar, character. At present employed in southern university, desires change to northern institution. Available on short notice. A 2132
- French: Woman, French born, former exchange student, assistant professor in state university. Wishes to find position in university or college with large department, allowing specialization where her specialization could be "beginners." A small school where she alone would be responsible for all the teaching of French would also be satisfactory. A 2133
- French, German, Spanish, also elementary Italian: Man, married, undergraduate work this country, European doctorate. Ten years' college experience. Extensive travel, publications. Recently returned from overseas. A 2134
- French, Spanish: Man, 37, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins. Phi Beta Kappa. Travel and study in France, Spain, Mexico. Author of a widely adopted French textbook. Eleven years' experience in eastern colleges. Available after June, 1944. A 2135
- Geography and Geology: Man, 36, draft exempt, head of a household; A.B., A.M., Ph.D. Special fields: regional, physical and economic geography; geopolitics; sedimentation, stratigraphic, engineering geology; paleontology. Successful teaching experience at high school, university, and teachers college levels. Business experience as owner and operator of private business of consulting geologist (petroleum and mining problems). Position with postwar future desired. Immediate availability. A 2136
- German: Man, married, 31, Ph.D., 10 years' teaching in American colleges and universities. Publications. Foreign travel. Has been teaching in A.S.T. Area and Language Program. Available immediately. A 2137
- German (Language and Literature): Man, 38, married, 2 children. M.A. and Ph.D. from Harvard University. Study and travel in Europe. Native American. Fourteen years' successful teaching experience in two leading universities; 2 years' high school experience as department head; other administrative experience. Many successful publications. Excellent recommendations. Now teaching in a New England university. Desires change: associate professorship in large university or chairmanship of German department in liberal arts college or small university. A 2138
- German, Germanic Linguistics: Man, 41, married, 15 years' experience. Foreign study. Publications. Has position as associate professor but desires change. A 2139

- History and German: Man, 34, married, no children, Protestant. German background, studies in Germany and U. S. A.; Ph.D. in European history, 1942. Special field: social and economic history; minor: sociology. Teaching experience, A.S.T.P. Now research assistant, wishes to return to teaching. Publications pending. A 2140
- Languages and Comparative Literature: Man, married, Ph.D., 11 years' college teaching experience, including French, German, Latin, Spanish, Italian, Greek, and Russian languages and literatures. Also qualified in Portuguese and Scandinavian languages. Three years' high school experience as department head. Publications and research. Now employed, 10 years with present institution. Desires position with good opportunities for advancement. Phi Beta Kappa, valedictorian of college class. Enthusiastic teacher. Excellent recommendations. A 2141
- Librarianship: A.B., A.M., Columbia University, postgraduate study in France and Germany. Wishes head librarianship or administrative position. Can also teach history, French, and German. A 2142
- Mathematics: Woman, Master's degree with extra year graduate work. Successful college teaching and administrative experience. Excellent references. Available after June 1, 1944. A 2143
- Music (music history, violin, orchestra, glee club, music education): Young woman, 25, single, greatly desires full- or part-time position as an instructor or assistant in a college or music school. B.M., University of Redlands (California); 2 years' graduate study at University of Southern California and completing M.Mus. Private violin study with prominent teachers; 12 years' orchestral work. Teaching experience in several progressive school systems. Ambitious for advancement. Available now. A 2144
- Philosophy, Psychology, Education: Man, married, two children. Training in three eastern universities; teaching experience in philosophy and psychology in one of these and in mid-western woman's college and state university. Extensive preparation in dynamic psychology, esthetics, the social sciences. M.A. thesis: "The Influence of Unconscious Factors on Moral Conduct." All Ph.D. requirements in philosophy met at outstanding eastern university except thesis on British moral sense school now being written in spare time. (Research in period completed.) Tenure in eastern secondary school: teach English; conduct public speaking and debating group; taught European history and economics. Research and publications in varied fields. Editorial, business, and public service experience. Prefer university or college offering opportunities for growth. Available after June, 1944. A 2145
- Physicist: Ph.D., 40, married, chairman of department of physics in midwestern university for eight years until 1942. Since then, senior physicist in charge of a government war project now nearing completion. Now also on research staff of Columbia University. Wishes to return to teaching and research position in west or midwest, offering permanent postwar connections. Available in September. A 2146
- Psychology: Man, 33, married, 2 children, draft deferred. Ph.D., Princeton. Phi Beta Kappa, Sigma Xi. Seven years' college teaching, research. Now employed. Wants to be located in east, preferably New England. Available September. A 2147
- Psychology: Man, 49, married, 1 child. Ph.D.; publications; Fellow, A.A.A.P.; Associate, A.P.A.; experience for several years in public school teaching, and 14 years as head of department of psychology (left it to get Ph.D.). Now employed as associate professor, and wishes headship or professorship in first-class southern college or university. Active in community and civic work. Available by fall 1944. A 2148

Psychologist and Language professor (French, German, Russian, Spanish, Comparative Literature): Man, married, 45, M.A., Ph.D. Sixteen years' teaching experience in midwestern colleges and universities. Publications and research in psychology and language methodology. Travel and residence in Europe for many years. Lately an A.S.T.P. instructor. At present available for position in teaching and/or research. A 2149

Romance Languages: Man, 49, married. Ph.D., Chicago (1925). Study and research at Paris, Harvard, Florence. Twenty years' teaching in large mid-western college, professor since 1936; secondary school experience. Publications, considerable activity in regional and national professional organizations, European residence and travel. Desires position, teaching or administration, preferably east of Mississippi River. Available September, 1945; possibly earlier. A 2150

Russian, French, German: Man, 53, Ph.D., Chicago (1927), 20 years' college and university teaching. Studied in Universities of Moscow, Paris, Berlin. Research, publications, Federal Government service. Now employed in an eastern university. Available for September, 1944. A 2151

Secretarial Science: Woman with Master's degree. Employed, but available June, 1944. References concerning personality and experience good. A 2152

Social Scientist and Linguist: Man, 45, Ph.D. Knowledge of political and social science, Italian, German, French, Spanish. Place without snow considered with preference because of recently fractured hip. Available in September. A 2153

RECENT PUBLICATIONS ON JUNIOR COLLEGES

The Literature of Junior College Terminal Education

By LOIS E. ENGLEMAN and WALTER C. EELLS. Contains more than 1,500 abstracts of articles, bulletins, and theses. Carefully classified and fully indexed. 336 pages. \$2.50 per volume.

Present Status of Junior College Terminal Education

By WALTER C. EELLS, BYRON S. HOLLINSHEAD, EDWARD F. MASON, and MAX SCHIFERL. Summary of nation-wide investigation on the status of terminal education in more than 400 junior colleges. Copiously illustrated. 350 pages. \$2.50 per volume.

Why Junior College Terminal Education?

By WALTER C. EELLS, JOHN W. HARBESON, EDWARD F. MASON, NICHOLAS RICCIARDI, WILLIAM H. SNYDER, and GEORGE F. ZOOK. An analysis of vital economic, social, and educational factors and summary of judgments of almost 2,000 educators and laymen. 390 pages. \$2.50 per volume.

Associate's Degree and Graduation Practices in Junior Colleges

By WALTER C. EELLS. Comprehensive information on history and use of associate in arts and other associate's degrees in more than 250 junior colleges, senior colleges, and universities. 136 pages. \$1.75 per volume.

Junior College Journal

Only national periodical devoted exclusively to the rapidly expanding junior-college field. Nine issues, September to May. \$3.00 per year.

Complete list of publications on request

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES
1201 NINETEENTH STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C.

A LOW-COST ILLUSTRATION

10-Year Term Insurance

Disability Waiver of Premium Included

At Age	Annual Premium Per \$1,000 Insurance	First Year Cash Dividends*
25	\$ 7.66	\$2.34
35	\$ 9.06	\$2.15
45	\$14.84	\$2.64

* 1943 Dividend Scale. Dividends, while not guaranteed, have been paid every year.

Term Insurance fits only temporary needs. Rates and description of *all* policies offered will be sent on request. You must take the initiative. We have no agents; the saving goes to you.

TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY ASSOCIATION

522 Fifth Avenue

New York, 18

Created and Endowed to Serve the Educational World

OUTSTANDING PUBLICATIONS ON THE AMERICAN COLLEGE

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, edited by Guy E. Snively. Issued four times a year. \$3.00.

The Colleges prepare for Peace—The Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Meeting. Annual Reports, Minutes, Membership, Constitution. (*Bulletin*, March, 1944.) \$1.50.

The American Colleges and the Social Order by Robert Lincoln Kelly. An interpretative and critical study of the development of American colleges and college education which gives new perspective to the much discussed problems of higher education today. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

Teaching with Books—A Study of College Libraries by Harvie Branscomb. Association of American Colleges, New York, and American Library Association, Chicago. \$2.50.

Comprehensive Examinations in the Humanities by Edward Safford Jones. Questions used in senior terminal examinations in the classics, English, modern languages, philosophy, art. Single copy, \$1.25; ten copies, \$10.00.

Comprehensive Examinations in American Colleges by Edward Safford Jones. 434 pages. \$2.50.

College Music by Randall Thompson. Report of an investigation of non-professional offerings in typical selected institutions under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation. The Macmillan Company, New York. \$2.50.

Orders for the above publications may be sent to the

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

19 West 44th Street, New York 18, N. Y.